Vol. XIV] NOV., 1956 – AUGUST, 1957 [Parts 1–4

THE JOURNAL OF THE GANGANATHA JHA RESEARCH INSTITUTE

GANGANATHA JHA RESEARCH INSTITUTE

स्थितधीर्मुनिरुच्यते

ALLAHABAD

Vol. XIV] NOV., 1956—AUGUST, 1957 [Parts 1—4

THE JOURNAL OF THE GANGANATHA JHA RESEARCH INSTITUTE

ALLAHABAD

Board of Editors

Dr. B. C. Law
Prof. R. D. Ranade
Dr. A. Siddiqi
Dr. Ishwari Prasad
Mm. Dr. Umesha Mishra

Published by
Principal G. C. TRIPATHI
G. N. Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeeth
Allahabad

Printed by - Offset Process
at VEENA PRINTING PRESS
92, New Katra, Dilkusha Park
Allahabad

JOURNAL

OF THE

GANGANATHA JHA RESEARCH INSTITUTE

NOVEMBER, 1956—AUGUST, 1957

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Teaching of the Brahmavidyā in the Mundakopaniṣad. By Shri P. C. Divanji, Bombay	1
The Date of Syamilaka's Padataditaka : About 500 A.D. By Dr. Dasharatha Sharma, Hindu College, Delhi	17
Bādarāyaṇa and Sankara : A Fresh Study. By Dr. P. M. Modi, Samaldas College, Bhavanagar . .	24
The Ṛgvedic Principles of Literary Criticism. By Prof. P. S. Sastri, Sagar University	37
Some Viṣṇu Sculptures from Mārwar. By Shri R. C. Agrawala, Supdt. Museums, Jodhpur Circle, Jodhpur	55
Nīlāmbaracarya. By Manoranjan Shastri, Principal Govt. Skt. College, Nalbari (Assam) . . .	75
Viṣa-Kanyā or Poison-Girl—An Instrument of Political Murder. By Dr. H. Vedantasastri, C. M. College, Darbhanga	87
Gāngeyadeva of Tirabhukti. By Shri Radha Krishna Choudhary, G. D. College, Begusarai . .	93
Fresh Light on यदुवंश, अनुप्रविष्ट After ययाति. By Shri Ramprasad Mazumdar, 138 B, Amherst Street, Calcutta —9	101
The Rise, Growth and Decay of Civilisation in India By Shri S. Ramayya, Accountant-General, U. P. Allahabad	107
Reviews of Books	151
Appendix	159
धर्मसिद्धान्तसंग्रह By रघुनन्दनभट्टाचार्य	27

JOURNAL

OF THE

GANGANATHA JHA RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Vol. XIV] NOVEMBER 1956—AUGUST 1957 [Parts 1—4

TEACHING OF THE BRAHMAVIDYĀ IN THE MUṆḌAKOPANIṢAD*

By ŚRĪ P. C. DIVANJI

I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

A COMPARATIVE study of the contents of the Upaniṣads of the Vedic period at once reveals that the *Muṇḍaka* holds a unique place among them. This is due to there being in it a systematic exposition of the doctrine of Brahmavidyā, the Science or Knowledge of Brahman, the source of all created beings having either organic or inorganic bodies. The Brahmavidyā taught there is different from that Brahmavidyā even after knowing which Nārada is reported in the *Chāndogya*[1] to have become only a "Mantravit", not an "Ātmavit" (a knower of words or names only, not of the Ātman, the essence). Sanatkumāra, on being requested to impart to him the knowledge of the Ātman in order that

*A Paper read in the Philosophy and Religion Section of the 17th Session of the All-India Oriental Conference at Ahmedabad on 31. 10. 53.

[1] *Chā. Upa.* VII, I. 2-5.

he may be able to swim across the ocean of sorrow or remorse, does acquaint him with a graded series of metaphysical concepts and ultimately says that it is the "Bhūmā", that is "Sukha", that it is the Ātman, the substratum of self-consciousness, that in fact it is not only everywhere but is the All and that it is on knowing it that one becomes attached to it, takes delight in it, feels satisfied, becomes master of oneself and is able to move about in all the regions at will. This however leaves many things about the Ātman and the way of approach to it etc., unsaid, as we shall see later on. Similarly, in the Bhṛguvallī of the *Taittirīya*, Bhṛgu is said to have approached his father Varuṇa for being taught what Brahman was and the latter asks him repeatedly to practise Tapas (meaning here to think intensely over the internal and external environments of the soul), to know that the Ātman should be looked for beyond all the five sheaths and realised as the essence of all that becomes the subject-matter of experience in the universe, by the method of constantly singing a particular Mantra of the *Sāmaveda*. There too the exposition is incomplete because it is not said who is qualified to receive the knowledge, how a teacher should be approached, what becomes of the soul and its sheaths after death etc. The *Kenopaniṣad* too first expounds the theory that the senses, and the mind and even the vital airs have no independent powers and are not the causes of the support of life but are on the contrary dependent for their powers on the Ātman, that one should try to know it and should not be egoistic after its knowledge is acquired, and it is later on illustrated by the story of the said truth having been brought home to Indra by the goddess Umā in what is called the "Brāhmī Upaniṣad". At the end of it, it is added that the said secret knowledge arises if one practises Tapas, Dama and Karma and that the Vedas are its Aṅgas and truth its receptacle. The ultimate fruit promised is a firm seat in the

last Svarga on the transgression of sin. There is in it no reference to the qualifications of and the way of approach to a Guru and none to the state of Jīvanmukti. The *Īśa* seems to have been composed primarily from the practical point of view as to how to behave in view of the conflicting advice of the Yajñikas and the Vedāntins as to the attitudes to be maintained towards the Vedic rites and the objects of enjoyment. The theoretical side of the doctrine of Brahmavidyā has not been considered at all. The *Aitareya* expounds only the nature of the Ātman in its cosmic and individual aspects. The *Praśna* is similarly concerned with only the functions of the vital airs and the *Māṇḍukya* with only the significance of the mystic syllable Oṁ taken. as made up of three simple syllables, A, U and M, representing the three states of the soul, and as the one indivisible symbol of the soul in the fourth state. The *Śvetāśvatara* contains a Śaivite monotheistic made by a single sage adaptation of the Sāṅkhya development of the Puruṣa and the Brahma doctrines and the necessity of Yoga added for self-realisation. Moreover, the exposition there is not systematic. The *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* and the *Chāndogya* Upaniṣads as they have been handed down to us from the time of Śaṅkarācārya, are, so to say, encyclopaedia of the speculations of various thinkers of certain schools of the white *Yajurveda* and *Sāmaveda* respectively on several topics of metaphysical and psychological interests carried on for several generations. Some of those speculations are based on comprehensive and minute observations on the internal and external environments of the thinkers and supply links in the chain of reasoning leading to the final formulation of the Vedānta doctrine such as has been done by Bādarāyaṇa in his *Śārīraka Sūtra*. Still those Upaniṣads do not even profess to record in a systematic form the teaching of Brahmavidyā as current in particular Śākhās of their respective Vedas, although with regard to some of the other vidyās, e.g.,

the Pañcāgnividyā[2], Vaiśvānaravidyā[3], and Mantravidyā[4], it has been made clear that they had been evolved at very late stages, and as the results of attempts made then for the realization of particular aspects of Brahman on the basis of a belief in an essential harmony between the natural forces at work in the macrocosm and the microcosm and in the evolution of social institutions through the powers of observation, reflection and creation of the human mind in an advanced stage of evolution. The *Maitrāyaṇī* does not deserve to be taken here into consideration because it purports avowedly to record a second-hand account of the Brahmavidyā as known to the Bālakhilyas from Prajāpati and that again as learnt by Śākāyanya from Maitreya, between whom and the Bālakhilyas no direct traditional connection has been mentioned and also because the said Vidyā is stated therein[5] to be otherwise capable of being designated as "Sarvopaniṣadvidyā", that is to say, a Vidyā as reconstructed from all the Upaniṣads then in existence within the memory of the living sages of the various schools then extant. The only Upanisad which can therefore stand comparison with the *Muṇḍaka* is the *Kaṭha*. That is an Upaniṣad of the Kāṭhaka Śākhā of the Black *Yajurveda*, while the former is that of the Muṇḍaka Śākhā of the *Atharvaveda*. A comparison of their contents will be made later on at the appropriate place.

II. COMPREHENSIVE VIEW OF THE CONTENTS OF THE UPANIṢAD

2. The *Muṇḍakopaniṣad* as a whole is divided into three parts called the First, Second and Third Muṇḍaka respectively and each of them has been sub-divided into two

[2] *Bṛ. A.* VI, 2; *Chā.* V. 1-10.
[3] *Chā.* V, II, 24.
[4] *Bṛ.* A. VI, 3-4.
[5] *Mai.* II, 3.

Sections called Khaṇḍas. The total number of verses therein is 64, there being 9 and 13 respectively in the two Sections of the first part and 10 and 11 respectively in the two Sections of each of the two remaining parts. The large majority of them is in the Triṣṭubh, a Vedic metre, the exact number as ascertained by Prof J. Hertel of Leipzig being 50[6]. The other metre in which he has found 10.5 verses to have been composed is the Vedic Anuṣṭubh. The remaining 3.5 are irregular in their composition and therefore incapable of being placed under a particular metre-class. The language employed is simple, emphasis having been laid on the subject-matter rather th n on the form of the exposition. That does not, however, mean that it is devoid of poetic embellishments. See for example, I.2.4-6 wherein the 7 flames of the sacrificial fire are called its tongues and the oblations are said to be conveying the sacr ficer via the sun's rays to the Brahmaloka telling him in sweet words: "Come, come, here is the Brahmaloka, the fruit of your meritorious deeds", or II. 2.3-4 wherein the process of meditation has been described in the terms of the science of archery, or III. 2.8 which compares the union of the soul with the Transcendental Puruṣa to the merger of the rivers in the ocean on forsaking names and forms. The metre Triṣṭubh composed in well-chosen words imparts melodiousness to the verses, as in III.2.3-8.

3. The real merit of this Upaniṣad which attracts attent on is the systematic exposition of the subject-matte therein. It purports to contain a record of the teaching of Brahmavidyā imparted by the sage Aṅgiras to a respectable householder named Śaunaka after the latter had approached him formally with a request to impart the knowledge of "that on knowing which all this becomes known":

[6] *Muṇḍakopaniṣad* with the Bhāṣya of Śaṅkara and the Gloss of Ānandagiri and an Introduction in German by Johannes Hertel, Leipzig, 1924.

Before the commencement of the reply the Upaniṣad contains the genesis of the Brahmavidyā, which is that it was Brahmā, the Creator and Preserver of the universe, who had originally imparted the knowledge of Brahman to his eldest son Atharvā and proceeds to state that the latter had transmitted it to Āṅgī, he again to Satyavāha of the Bharadvāja family, and he to Aṅgiras, whom Śaunaka had approached for instruction. He commences it by drawing a distinction between two sorts of Vidyā, namely Parā (superior or transcendental) and Aparā (inferior or non-transcendental). He defines the latter as consisting of the four Vedas and their six Aṅgas and the former as that by which that Akṣara becomes known. This Akṣara is identified with the eternal, all-pervading, most subtle and indestructible source of all the created beings, which though not cognisable by any of the senses of perception is visualized in all its glory by men of discriminative vision. Since there is an apparent anomaly in such an entity being the source of all sorts of beings it is shown to be possible by pointing to the analogous cases of a spider creating a web out of itself, organic bodies like plants coming out of the earth and lifeless hairs coming out of the bodies of living creatures. It is also explained by what means and in what order evolution from Brahman in its manifestation as life and the means of sustaining it come into existence. Next, in order that the Parāvidyā may be better appreciated the author says in 1.2 that it was in the Tretāyuga that men of penetrating vision saw in the Vedic Mantras the possibility of being made use of in sacrificial rites for the attainment of a heavenly region after death and persuaded men to be engaged in diverse sorts of sacrifices. But they were misguided because the region thus reached is required to be quitted when the accumulated merit is exhausted, with the result that there is a fresh birth on this earth and that such experience is repeated endlessly. As compared with them those who betake themselves to

forests depending upon Tapas and Śraddhā and move about begging for alms, repair after death to the region of that immortal and indestructible Puruṣa through the sun. But the best ideal for a Brāhmaṇa is to take stock of the regions attained by Karma, to cease to have attachment towards them and for knowing that which cannot be attained by Karma, he should approach a Vaidic Brāhmaṇa who is devoted to Brahman. When so approached by a person, whose mind has been pacified and under control he should impart to him that Science of Brahman by means of which one knows the Akṣara (Indestructible) Puruṣa to be the truth. Here ends the First Muṇḍaka.

4. The First Section of Part II is intended to establish that though the different forms of the finite objects in all the regions have emanated from the Akṣara or Avyākṛta (Unmanifest) like sparks from fire the source is the Divine Puruṣa, who is both inside and outside the objects, is not born, has no vital breath and no mind and is the Pure One, who transcends the Akṣara, the source of the various entities. In verses 1-2 of the Second Section of the same Part it is made clear that in the bodies of the created beings it becomes manifest as the great principle which, located in the heart-cave, becomes visible by the involuntary actions of the vital breath and the muscles of the eyes and is beyond consciousness, that it is the Akṣara-Brahman, the principle of life identical with the vital breath and the mind, in which are located all the regions and the beings residing therein, that it is the Truth and is immortal, and it is that which deserves to be pierced through. The next two verses graphically describe the process by which that can be effected. It is that just as an archer can pierce through a target set before him by darting a pointed arrow from a bow with undivided attention so a Sādhaka should, with his mind sharpened by meditation, make a bid for the Akṣara. In this case the target is the above-mentioned Brahman, the

Praṇava (mystic syllable Oṁ) is the bow supplied by the Upaniṣad, the arrow is one's Ātman (meaning here the ego) and the place of the hand by which the bow is to be stretched is to be filled by the mind filled with a determination to pierce the target through. The next three verses make it clear that the said principle which permeates all the three regions and also the vital airs and the mind is the only one thing to be known as the Ātman, that it, moving about among the Nāḍis (veins) arranged like spokes in the nave of a wheel becomes born, i.e., manifest to the consciousness in various forms and that when it is meditated upon as the Oṁ it becomes visualized beyond the darkness in the "Vyoman" (space or sky) known as the "Divya Brahmapura" (Divine City of Brahman). This principle taking the form of the mind is the guide of the vital air and the body and is firmly located also in the food that we consume daily, and it is this which, men having a discriminative intellect visualize completely by their consciousness as of the nature of joy and immortality. Verse 8 says that as the result of that vision the bond of the heart is broken, all doubts are resolved and (past) actions are exhausted. The next two verses graphically describe that vision as consisting of a representation of the Absolute Brahman as a spotless Light of Lights inside a golden case, where neither the sun nor the moon and stars nor lightning shine but on the contrary it is its light which shines through everything. The last verse goes a step further and states that what in fact is found to exist in all directions is Brahman, the Immortal one, that it is that itself which has spread out above and below and that therefore this excellent universe is nothing else but Brahman.

5. The exposition of the Brahmavidyā practically ends here. This Upaniṣad however contains the Third Muṇḍaka, the object of adding which according to Śaṅkara is to mention the Sādhanas (means) which are likely to be

helpful in the acquisition of the direct knowledge of Brahman. Towards that end it starts with the popular notion of there being in fact two souls, namely the individual and the supreme, embodied in the *Ṛgveda Mantra*[7] wherein they are described as two birds perched upon the same tree, one of which tastefully enjoys its fruits but is possessed of limited powers and is consequently filled with remorse while the other merely looks on but is all joy, being possessed of unlimited powers which make it the Lord of all that is. It is further said that the former attains perfect equality with the latter when, on being duly qualified, it visualizes the other and shaking off its remorse becomes free from the effects of merit and demerit. When the wise man further realizes that it is the Ātman itself that becomes manifest through all the beings he ceases to speak at random, becomes attached to the Ātman and takes delight in its activities. The realization thereof inside the heart as the pure light arises only if he has regard for truth, observes celibacy for ever and acquires right knowledge. Special emphasis is laid on speaking truth because it is thereby that the path of the gods, by which the sages whose desires are satisfied cross over to the highest receptacle of truth, is spread out before an aspirant. It is by means of the mind cleared of all impurities which have entered into it through the vital airs, that this, the greatest of the great, the smallest of the small, the most distant and also the nearest for those whose inner vision has been opened out can be visualized as located in the heart-cave, not by any of the senses nor by means of any ceremonial acts or penances. This vision gives to the achiever thereof, whose inner being has been purified, the power to repair to any region he likes and that to get whatever things he desires to have. The First Section ends here. It obviously relates to the realization of the Akṣara, the Brahman as it becomes manifest in the diverse

[7] II. 8.17.

forms inside and outside one's body. The highest object of man's pursuit according to this Upaniṣad is, however, the realization of the Absolute Brahman, called in it the "Puruṣa". The Second Section relates to the method of Upāsanā thereof. As a preface to it, it is said that he who entertains any desires whatsoever, even though they may be selfless, is reborn at the places where they are capable of being fulfilled while who adores the Puruṣa without entertaining any desires passes beyond that "Śukra" (seed of the universe), that the said Ātman in its aspect of the Absolute is reached, not by study nor by intellectual reasoning nor by listening to talks about it but by its own favour, provided one tries to realize it with strength of will, perseverence and knowledge accompanied by Vairāgya (spirit of non-attachment to objects). What happens as the result thereof is that the self of the Sādhaka enters the abode of Brahman, the Puruṣa. And as it is all-pervading his self too enters everything and like it remains unaffected by anything even though it too gains the quality of omniscience. To speak in the language of the later Vedānta, the man who has such a realization is a "Jīvanmukta" (liberated while yet living). So far as his soul is concerned, there being no longer the sense of individuality, there is no further step left for it to be reached. But in the eyes of the other embodied souls it continues to be just one more embodied soul. And since there can be many such from their standpoint, the author taking that standpoint into consideration says that such immortal souls are finally released at the time of death, that is to say, those individual souls reach the Absolute, Divine Puruṣa, freed from everything which has name and form, such as the Prāṇas, Indriyas, Karma and even the Ātman of the nature of (individual) consciousness and they too become merged and assimilated in the Absolute, Indestructible One. Similarly, for the satisfaction of the

other embodied souls the author states that no one in the family of a knower of Brahman remains ignorant of it. The last two verses lay down the rule for the guidance of future generations, on the authority of a "Ṛcā" (meaning here a Mantra of the *Atharvaveda*) and the sage Aṅgiras that this Vidyā should be imparted only to one who has observed the "Śirovrata" (a vow observed while carrying the Ekarṣi fire on a shaven head), who is devoted to the discharge of his religious duties, is learned in the Veda and has faith in the Brahmavidyā.

III. COMPARISON THEREOF WITH THOSE OF THE KAṬHOPANIṢAD

6. The broad outlines of the teaching of the Brahmavidyā in the *Muṇḍakopaniṣad* can be stated thus :—(1) Geneology of teachers and pupils commencing from Brahma, the first of the gods, and ending with Angiras, who instructed Śaunaka, a great householder[8]; (2) Mention of the two vidyās, Parā and Aparā and their explanations[9]; (3) Description of the Akṣara, the source of the beings, as completely visualized by the wise and of the cosmic evolution from it[10]; (4) Origin of the institution of the religion of Vedic sacrifices and the inducement held out for following its dictates, namely the prospect of attaining Brahmaloka[11]; (5) Inefficiency of the sacrificial and charitable religious acts to ensure freedom from old age and death and condemnation thereof as "Avidyā" and those who resort to it as infatuated, blind etc.[12]; (6) Religion of the forest-dwellers and their attainment of the Puruṣa who is indestructible by nature[13]; (7) Course of

[8] I. 1. 1-3.
[9] I. 1. 4-5.
[10] I. 1. 6-9.
[11] I. 2. 1-6.
[12] I. 2. 7-10.
[13] I. 2. 11.

Vairāgya and formal approach to a Brahmaniṣṭha Śrotriya for the knowledge, known as "Brahmavidyā", of that eternal stage, the Akṣara-Puruṣa, which cannot be attained by acts, recommended for a Brāhmaṇa, and the qualifications required for initiation by the Guru[14]; (8) Elaboration of the theory that the Divine Puruṣa is the source of all the diverse entities of the internal and external worlds and also their inner self, that it further envelopes all of them and that since that is so, this universe is the Puruṣa itself and that the knowledge thereof as residing in the heart-cave of man is the means for the destruction of nescience[15]; (9) Similar elaboration of the theory that the great entity moving about and becoming manifest in the involuntary actions of the parts of the body is also smallest of the small and yet all the regions and their residents are located therein and that it is that which is to be pierced through like an archer's target by the mind sharpened by Upāsanā with the use of the Praṇava as the bow, that when it is pierced by wise men they visualize the Ātman as the Light of Lights inside a golden case in the heart-cavity, shining by its own light, which is also the source of the resplendence of the celestial luminaries and that being so, all this phenomenal universe is Brahman, the Immortal One[16]; (10) Progress of the Sādhaka from the standpoint of an average human being, including some rules of conduct and the result achieved in terms of material values[17]; (11) Consequence of the appreciation of such values, the means by which one can avoid it and attain the highest possible spiritual value, defined as an entry of the self into the abode of Brahman, acquisition of the knowledge of the all from that abode, which is the

---

[14] I. 2. 12-13.

[15] II. 1.

[16] II. 2.

[17] III. 1.

Divine Puruṣa, contentment, peace of mind and freedom from attachment to objects of ephemeral values[18]; (12) Dissolution of all the physical evolutes including individual consciousness and complete release of the self and merger of all in the Absolute, the Indestructible one, the Transcendental Puruṣa[19]; (13) Effect of the realization of Parama Brahman on one's progeny[20] and (14) Test prescribed by the *Atharvaveda* and the sage Aṅgiras for an aspirant for intiation in this Brahmavidyā[21].

7. The *Kaṭhopaniṣad* has, like the *Muṇḍakopaniṣad*, six Sections in all but they are distributed between two parts and the names given to them are also "Adhyāya" and "Vallī" respectively. The total number of verses in it is 118 as against 64 in the *Muṇḍaka*. There is a distinction drawn between the two kinds of learning, namely that concerning "Yogakṣema" (acquisition of a thing not possessed and preservation intact of that already possessed) and that concerning the knowledge of the Self in the *Kaṭha* but they are distinguished, not as lower and higher, but as "Vidyā" and "Avidyā" (Science and Nescience). The true nature of the Ātman is the same as that of the "Akṣara-Puruṣa" and that is the highest object to be attained according to both but the *Kaṭha* sets no value, even as secondary ideal to be aimed at, on the acquisition of powers of the "Akṣara-Brahman" to move about all the regions at will and to have one's all desires fulfilled, including the acquisition of the knowledge of all the objects in this universe by the knowledge of the one, as the *Muṇḍaka* does. In fact the introductory portion[22] makes it perfectly clear that its author wished to provide for the need of those

[18] III. 2. 1-5.

[19] III. 2. 6-8.

[20] III. 2. 9.

[21] III. 2.10-11.

[22] I. 1. 1-10.

aspirants only who have risen above the temptations offered by the objects of sense-enjoyment and the means of personal comfort. This is confirmed by the additional passage[23] in which it is said that Naciketas had firmly rejected all such offers made by Death personified. This also explains why there is no reference in the *Kaṭha* to the religion of the Yājñikas and the destination aimed at by them. The fact that there is an imaginary instructor further explains why there is no geneology in that Upaniṣad. The Vidyā expounded therein contains nothing that is not in the other Upaniṣad, although the name given to it is "Adhyātmavidyā" instead of "Brahmavidyā". However, there is some distinguishing feature in it and it is that whereas in the *Muṇḍaka*[24] a distinction has been drawn between the "Akṣara-Brahman", the "Śukra" (Seed of the Universe) and the "Akṣara-Puruṣa", (the Transcendental One) or between "Brahman" and "Parama Brahman", no such distinction has been drawn in the *Kaṭha*. Of course, even in the former, the two are only the different aspects of the same Ultimate Reality but in the latter these aspects have not been distinguished, the same Brahman who is called the "Śukra" in II.3.1 being also called the "Puruṣa", the "Kāṣṭhā Parā Gati" in I.3.11. and the "Parama Pada" in 1.3.9 of Viṣṇu, a Paurāṇic god finding no mention in the *Muṇḍaka*. There is also no mention in it of what happens to the inner environment of the Self after death as in the *Muṇḍaka*[25]. As regards the means for the realization of the ideal state, whereas in the latter there is the mention of a mental exercise only with the help of the Praṇava, and of truth-speaking etc., as the subsidiary means[26] in the former on the other hand the "Yogavidhi" that has been recommended consists of the "Durga Patha" (difficult path) of the

[23] I. 1. 20-29.

[24] II. 1-2 and III. 1.

[25] III. 2. 7.

[26] II. 2. 3-4 and III. 1. 4-5.

Yoga described in I.3.1-14 and II.3.7-16, from which description one can see that one has to practise "Dhāraṇā", "Dhyāna" and "Samādhi", rising step by step, and that for that purpose one has to kindle the "Svargya Agni" (heavenly fire) known as the "Naciketā Agni". Although "Triṇāciketā" is the name of a sacrificial fire kindled by an Adhvaryu priest the above fire appears to me to be the internal fire, which according to the method of the Kuṇḍalinī-Yoga is to be kindled through the observance of the vow (Śirovrata) connected with that fire, for rarifying the vital air in order that it may be able to rise up to the crown of the head through the "Suṣumnā Nāḍī"[27], whose mouth is opened when the Kuṇḍalinī is awakened by Prāṇāyāmas practised with the "Mūlabandha" Mudrā. Of course, the above-mentioned terms and the process are not defined and described in the Upaniṣad but the "Śevadhi" (valuable treasure) referred to in *Kaṭha*[28], and the "Aditir devatāmayī" who "takes birth as the Prāṇa and who having entered the cave resides therein and takes births through the beings" (referred to in II.1.7) support such an hypothesis. One more distinguishing feature that is noticeable in the *Kaṭha* is the emphatic assertion in II.1.10-11 as to there being "no diversity here", which has been made more emphatic by its repetition, accompanied by a mention of the consequence to whoever looks upon this universe as if there were diversity in it, the diverse forms of the objects being later on explained[29] as being the assumed forms of the One, like those of fire and wind.

---

[27] *Kaṭha*. II. 3. 16.

[28] I. 2.10. The valuable treasure referred to in the above verse is that there is the axiom that the Eternal One cannot be attained by the non-eternal substances. But that axiom is violated in this case; "because", says Death, "I have kindled this fire with non-eternal substances and the Eternal One is attained thereby".

[29] II. 2. 11-12.

IV. CONCLUDING REMARKS

8. All the points of difference between the doctrine of Brahmavidyā supplemented by meditation expounded in the *Muṇḍakopaniṣad* and that of the Adhyātmavidyā and the practice of Yoga recommended for the realization of the Ātman in the *Kaṭhōpaniṣad* considered as a whole, lead to the reasonable conclus on that the former had been formulated at an earlier stage in the evolution of the doctrine of the Upaniṣad school as embodied in the *Śārīraka Sūtra*, when, while on the one hand, it had already been ascertained that for securing complete freedom from metemopsychosis it was essential that the mind should be completely free from even the desire for the acquisition by self-realization of the powers to move about anywhere at will and to get the fulfilment of whatever desires crop up in the mind after such realization and that for that purpose one should realize one's identity with the Transcendental Essence, it was, on the other hand, not considered absolutely essential for an aspirant for self-realization to purge his mind of all kinds of longings, as it seems to have been at the time when the *Kaṭhopaniṣad* was composed. The *Bhagavadgītā* represents a later stage than that represented by that Upaniṣad but I will take some other occasion to establish that fact.

THE DATE OF ŚYĀMILAKA'S PĀDATĀḌITAKA : ABOUT 500 A.D.

By Dr. Dasharatha Sharma

Of the Sanskrit works discovered during the last fifty years, Śyāmilaka's *Pādatāḍitaka* is one of the most important. Sanskrit stylists find its prose 'the veritable ambrosia of Sanskrit speech[1]'. Students of the Sanskrit drama regard its study as essential, specially for the type of the drama known as *bhāṇa*; and it would be no less useful for the historian, if he could fix its date, because free from the conventions that bind most Sanskrit dramas, this *bhāṇa* throws a flood of light on the social and cultural conditions of the period when it was composed.

The first writers to suggest a date for it were its editors, M. Ramakrishna Kavi and S. K. Ramanatha Sastri, who put it between 800 and 900 A. D. on the basis of the references of Abhinavagupta, Kuntaka, Kṣemendra, and Hemacandra[2]. Writing two years later, in the *Centenary Supplement* of the *JRAS.*, 1924, pp. 123-136, and in *JRAS.*, 1924, pp. 262-265, Professor F. W. Thomas concluded that the drama was written about "the time of Harṣa of Kanauj or even that of the later Guptas". Dr. S. K. De endorsed this view in the *History of Sanskrit Literature*, Vol. I., p. 249[3]. The last attempt to fix its date that is known to me is that of Prof. T. Burrow who puts its composition in the early part of the fifth century A. D. on the following grounds[4] :—

(1) The play refers to both the Śakas and Hūṇas. The Śakas practically disappear from the scene after the conquest of Mālwā, Surāṣṭra and the Western provinces by Candra-

---

[1] See the opinion of Prof. F. W. Thomas quoted by Prof. Burrow, *JRAS.*, 1946, p. 47.

[2] The *Caturbhāṇī*, Introduction, p. v.

[3] The co-editor of the *History*, Dr. S. N. Dasgupta, however, says, " It is not improbable that he (Śyāmilaka) may have lived between 800 and 900 A. D". He gives no reasons for differing from Dr. De (*History of Sanskrit Literature*, I, p. 762).

[4] *JRAS.*, 1946, pp. 46-53.

gupta II Vikramāditya in the last decade of the fourth century. On the other hand, the Hūṇas do not play a part in Indian history up to the middle of the fifth century, when their invasion was repelled by Skandagupta. An author to whom both Śakas and Hūṇas were familiar may be presumed to have flourished between these two dates.

(2) "A certain Ārya-Ghoṭaka is introduced who though no Hun appears dressed as one." This shows familiarity with the real Hūṇas, who at the time were outside the empire envisaged by the drama. "That was the state of affairs prevailing early in the fifth century."

(3) Mahāpratihāra Bhadrāyudha's conquest of Mālwā, Aparānta and Śaka kingdoms must have been the result of Candragupta II's campaign to put an end to the Śaka rule in Ujjain. The date of this conquest is the last decade of the fourth century A.D.

(4) Indradatta or Indrasvāmin of Koṅkaṇa, a contemporary of Śyāmilaka, can be identified with Indradatta of the Traikūṭaka dynasty who probably ruled about 410 A.D. as his son, Dahrasena, was reigning in 456 A. D.

We must be thankful to Prof. Burrow for drawing our attention to these facts in the drama. But I fear he has misinterpreted the word, Ārya-Ghoṭaka, misidentified Indradatta of Koṅkaṇa and given the simultaneous reference to Śakas and Hūṇas in the drama a significance that it does not have. He has overlooked also an important political event which definitely puts the composition of the drama somewhere in the first decade of the sixth instead of the fifth century.[5]

The word, *Āryaghoṭaka*, occurs in the sentence, *Aye kasyāyam-aHūṇo Hūṇa-maṇḍana-maṇḍitaḥ Āryaghoṭakaḥ Pāṭaliputrikāyāḥ puṣpadāsyāḥ bhavanadvāramāviṣkaroti*[6]. As the

[5] Prof. Burrow refers to Bhaṭṭi Maghavarman but does not try to identify him.

[6] *Pādatāḍitaka*, p. 15.

property of some-one indicated by the pronoun, *kasya*, this *Āryaghoṭaka* obviously is no human being at all but only a horse (*ghoṭaka*) of the Indian (*ārya*) breed with Hūṇa ornaments. The reference is important, because this familiarity with even the ornaments used by the Hūṇas for their horses could ordinarily be possible only after Hūṇa horses with Hūṇa ornaments had reached the heart of the country, i.e. after 457 A.D. or so when their first invasion had been repelled by Skandagupta.

As regards the reference to the Śakas' defeat by Bhadrāyudha it can put Śyāmilaka in c. 410 A.D., only if it be proved that Bhadrāyudha's conquests were a part of Candragupta II's campaign against the Śaḳas. In Candragupta II's reign the Śakas were rulers of Mālwā, Kāṭhiāwār and Gujarāt. In the campaign of Bhadrāyudha they are neither in Mālwā nor Aparānta[7], which proves, if anything, that Bhadrāyudha was not Candragupta II's contemporary. They may then have been in Surāṣṭra, from where we have in the drama a Śaka prince named Jayanta or Jayanandaka.[8] Prof. Burrow admits the Śakas' political existence even after 410 A.D.[9] They may have been partly responsible for the troubles that assailed the Gupta empire towards the end of Kumāragupta I's reign[10]. At least they appear to have been a difficult people to control, for Skandagupta, the next emperor, had to do some hard thinking before he selected Parṇadatta as the Governor of Surāṣṭra.[11]

---

[7] See the verse,

Yen-Āparānta-Śaka-Mālavá-bhūpatīnām
kṛtvā śirassu caraṇau caratā yatheṣṭam |
kālebhyupetya jananīm jananīm ca Gaṅgā-
māviṣkṛtā Magadha-rāja-kulasya lakṣmīḥ || v. 54

Here the Śakas, as shown also by Prof. Burrow's translation, are differentiated from the rulers of Aparānta and Mālwā.

[8] *Pādatāḍitaka*, pp. 7 and 30. [9] *JRAS.*, 1946, p. 50.

[10] The reading युध्यमित्रांश्च in verse 4 of the Bhitarī inscription would suit this context admirably.

[11] Jūnāgaḍh inscription, verses 7-13.

Further, we must remember that the date of Bhadrāyudha's defeat of the Śakas does not stand by itself as an isolated event. It has to be somewhere very near his defeat and dispossession of Indradatta of Koṅkaṇa and Bhaṭṭi Maghavarman of Ānandapura. Indradatta is described as the *prathamaḥ Aparāntādhipatiḥ*, i.e., the previous ruler of Aparānta.[12] It was probably on his head that Bhadrāyudha placed his feet and thereby inspired the maidens of Aparānta to sing of his (Bhadrāyudha's) deeds on the shores of the ocean which are garlanded by rows of date-palms.[13] And richly did Indradatta deserve to be defeated, dispossessed and pensioned off[14], for as described in the play he is a rake of rakes, most of whose time is spent in running after *veśyas*. Prof. Burrow identifies Indradatta with Indradatta I, the founder of the Traikūṭaka dynasty. But keeping in view his character and the fact that instead of founding a kingdom he lost one, I prefer equating him with the unknown successor of Vyāghrasena Traikūṭaka in whose reign the Traikūṭaka dynasty ended all of a sudden. Vyāghrasena's Sūrat Grant was issued from Aniruddhapura in the year 241 (489 A.D.). An inscription of the year 245 (493 A. D.) refers to the 'increasing sway of the Traikūṭakas'. It is not therefore unreasonable to put this Indradatta II's deposition about 500 A.D.

The other dispos essed prince, Bhaṭṭi Maghavarman from Ānandapura, is a son of *Senāpati* Senaka.[15] This makes

---

[12] *Pādatāḍitaka*, p. 7. प्रथम cannot here be given the sense of first, unless we suppose that some one had already succeeded Indradatta. This would again mean that he had been deposed.

[13] *Velānilair-mṛdubhir-ākulitālakāntā*
gāyanti yasya caritāny Aparāntakāntāḥ |
utkaṇṭhitāḥ samavalambya latāstarūṇām
hintālamāliṣu tateṣu mahārṇavasya ||
Pādatāḍitaka, v. 55

[14] Their deposition alone is mentioned in the drama. But from the way they spend money it seems that they received a generous pension from the State or had been provided for in some other way.

[15] *Pādatāḍitaka*, p. 15,

him a scion of the Maitraka line of Valabhī which, according to Jain sources, had Ānandapura[16] as one of its chief cities. As for *Sen pati* Senaka he may be identified with the Maitraka ruler Dharasena I, Sena or Senaka (like Datta for Yajñadatta and Devadatta of the *Pātañjala Mahābhāṣya*)[17] being a shortened form of some name like Dharasena, Dhruvasena or Guhasena. The claim of the other Senakas in the line, however, can be ignored, as Dharasena I is the only ruler with a Sena termination who bears the title *Senāpati*; all others are either *Mahārājas* or *Mahārājādhirājas*. As Dharasena's father, *Senāpati* Bhaṭārka, ruled from c. 467 to 475 A.D. and Dharasena's younger brother, Droṇasimha, was on the throne in 502 A. D., having been crowned king some time before this date by an Emperor who, curiously enough, is given no name but merely called *akhilabhuvanamaṇḍalābhogaikasvāmin*[18] (a title that reminds one of the anonymous *Sārvabhauma-narendra* of the *Pādatāḍitaka*), we should not be unjustified in putting Dharasena I and Maghavarman in the period 475—502 A.D. About 500 A. D., Maghavarman may have got mixed up in anti-Gupta activities and consequently substituted by the Gupta nominee, Droṇasiṁha.

It is difficult to identify the *Sārvabhauma* ruler who was a contemporary of Indradatta and Bhaṭṭi Maghavarm n. Gupta chronology after the death of Budhagupta is extremely uncertain. He may have been Budhagupta's immediate successor. Perhaps early in this Sārvabhauma's reign, the western provinces of the Empire threw off the Gupta yoke and transferred their allegiance to the Vākāṭaka ruler, Hariṣeṇa (c. 475—500 A. D.) who claims having conquered

[16] Here in the reign of Dhruvasena I the Jaina teacher, Dhaneśvara Sūri, read out the Kalpasūtra. The event is commemorated even now by the reading of the scripture during the *Paryuṣaṇa* period. (Dr. H. Jacobi's edition of the *Kalpasūtra*, p. 67).

[17] I. 189.

[18] See Dhruvasena I's Pālitānā Copper-plate Grant, line 8. Droṇasiṁha's date can be had from his Bhamodarā Copper-plate Grant of (G. E.) 183.

or extended his influence over Avanti, Trikūṭa and Lāṭa[19]. Mahāpratihāra Bhadrāyudha, who till then had been a Governor of the north-western provinces of the Empire, came now to its rescue and inflicted a crushing defeat on the anti-Gupta confederacy, depriving some of its members even of their ancestral dominions. But it was only a short respite that he gained for the Empire, for by 510 A. D. the Hūṇas had swooped down the plains of the Punjāb, Rājasthān and Mālwā, reached at least as far as Eran, and deprived the Gupta Empire of some of its fairest provinces, 500 A.D., the approximate year of Bhadrāyudha's conquests, may therefore be regarded as the upper and 510 A.D. as the lower limit of the composition of Śyāmilaka's *Pādatāḍitaka*. By the latter year the empire envisaged by the drama had ceased to exist. At any time much earlier than 500 A. D., it would have been impossible to refer to some of the historical events discussed above, e.g., the deposition of Indradatta and Maghavarman and the extensive conquests of Bhadrāyudha.[20]

---

[19] *Sa Kuntal-Āvanti-Kalinga-Kośala-*
Trikūṭa-Lāṭ-Āndhra.....
(verse 18 of Hariṣeṇa's Ajantā Inscription)

[20] The posteriority of the drama to the reign of Skandagupta specially is obvious from Śyāmilaka's conscious imitation of the images found in the following verses of the Bhitarī inscription:

Vicalita-kulalakṣmī-stambhanāyodyatena
kṣititala-śayanīye yena nītā triyāmā |
samudita-bala-kośān (*Yudhyamitrāṁ* or *Puṣyamitrāṁśca*) *jitvā*
kṣitipa-caraṇapīṭhe sthāpito vāmapādaḥ || 4.
Prasabhamanupamauvvidhvastaśastrapratīpau
vinayasamucitaiśca kṣāntiśauryairnnirūḍham |
caritam-amalakīrter-gīyate yasya śubhraṁ
diśi diśi parituṣṭair-ākumāraṁ manuṣyaiḥ || 5.
Pitari divamupete viplutāṁ vaṁśalakṣmiṁ
bhujabalavijitārīryyaḥ pratiṣṭhāpya bhūyaḥ |
jitamiti paritoṣān-mātaraṁ sāsranetrāṁ
hatariputiva Kṛṣṇo Devakīm-abhyupetaḥ ||6.

The parallel verses from the *Pādatāḍitaka* have been quoted above in footnotes 6 and 12. It may be noted further that it is not only imagery but the language also that has been copied.

BĀDARĀYAṆA AND ŚAṄKARA: A FRESH STUDY

By Dr. P. M. Modi

Apart from the interpretational difference leading to doctrinal difference between the Sūtrakāra and Śaṅkara in the matter of the interpretation of the Upaniṣads and between Śaṅkara and ourselves in that of the *Brahmasūtra*, we may say here a few words by comparison of the systems of Bādarāyaṇa and Śaṅkara.

A tentative disscussion of Comparision between Bādarāyaṇa and Śaṅkara.

As this paper is being placed before the public with a view to the preparation of a big work covering the entire *Brahmasūtra* and going deeper into the various problems raised herein, it is not very safe to expand the Sūtrakāra's system by comparing it with other systems, e.g., that of Śaṅkara except only in few very prominent points, which even can be only tentatively discussed here.

Śaṅkara : Para-Brahman is absolutely without attributes. Sūtrakāra not so.

With the Sūtrakāra, as also with Śaṅkara, the most important problem is that about the two aspects of Brahman. According to Śaṅkara, these two aspects are *nirguṇa* and *saguṇa* respectively; while the Sūtrakāra describes them as *arūpavat* and *rūpavat*. Thus, with Śaṅkara one aspect is absolutely without any attributes, while according to the Sūtrakāra one aspect has no form (*rūpa*, the figure of a *puruṣa*) yet it has attributes (*viśeṣaṇas*) as well as the other aspect, there being no Brahman altogether without attributes.[1] The Sūtrakāra understands Brahman as a Reality which is *at the same time arūpavat* and *rūpavat*.[2] He seems to distinguish between Śrutis which describe the *arūpavat* and Śrutis which describe the *rūpavat* and thus he dis-

[1] विशिंषन्ति हीतरवत्। *Bra. Sū.* III. 3.37

[2] न स्थानतोऽपि परस्योभयलिङ्गं सर्वत्र हि। *Bra. Sū.* III. 2.11

tinguishes between the attributes of the *arūpavat* and those of the *rūpavat* aspect of Brahman. The *guṇas* of Brahman referred to in *Bra. Sū.* I.1 are those of the *arūpavat*, viz., *ānanda* and others,[3] while those collected by him in *Bra. Sū.* I.2 and 3 belong to the *rūpavat*. Thus, *praśāsana* 'ruling' is an attribute of the *rūpavat* aspect of Brahman. He has collected these attributes under the two lists of *satyādayaḥ* and *āyatanādayaḥ*.[4] In spite of this distinction about the attributes of the two aspects, the Śrutis in the opinion of the Sūtrakāra characterise the *arūpavat* with the attributes of the *rūpavat* and *vice versa*.[5] In the opinion of the Sūtrakāra it is not possible to fix the attributes of either of the two aspects.[6] So, ultimately, the only distinction we can definitely make between the two aspects is that of the possession of or the absence of the *rūpa* of the Puruṣa according as the aspect is *rūpavat* or *arūpavat*.

Superiority of the *Arūpavat* to the *Rūpavat*.

Again, according to Śaṅkara, one aspect (the *nirguṇa* one) is higher while the other (*saguṇa*) is lower. The Sūtrakāra also takes one aspect (the *arūpavat*) as the chief one (*pradhāna* or *mukhya*);[7] but Brahman is *arūpavat* not in the sense that it is exclusively *arūpavat*; but it is *arūpavat* only in the sense that it is *chiefly arūpavat*.[8] Therefore, according to the Sūtrakāra Brahman is *at the same time rūpavat* also. Again,

---

[3] Vide Note on *Bra. Sū.* III. 3.38-39 in our work, *A Critique of the Brahmasūtra* : Part I : Interpretation of the Sūtras.

[4] Vide Note on *Bra. Sū.* III. 3.38-39 in *A Critique of the Bra. Sū.* Part I.

[5] विशिंषन्ति हीतरवत्। *Bra. Sū.* III 3.37.

[6] तन्निर्धारणानियमः। *Bra. Sū.* III. 3.42.

[7] अरूपवदेव हि तत्प्रधानत्वात्। *Bra. Sū.* III. 2.14.

आनन्दादयः प्रधानस्य। *Bra. Sū.* III. 3.11.

प्रधानवदेव तदुक्तम्। *Bra. Sū.* III. 3.53.

परं जैमिनिर्मुख्यत्वात्। *Bra. Sū.* IV. 3.

[8] This is the sense of एव in अरूपवदेव हि तत्प्रधानत्वात्। *Bra. Sū.* III. 2.14.

Bādarāyaṇa regards the *arūpavat* as the more important aspect of the two in the sense that the *rūpavat* aspect depends upon the *arūpavat*.[9] This dependence can be illustrated by the example of the coil (kuṇḍala) of a serpent which has a *rūpa* dependent upon the serpent (*ahi*) which is a term used for serpent without a reference to any form of the serpent,[10] or by the example of the substratum of light, e.g., the solar orb (i.e. the Sun), the lamp etc. which *has a form* (circular, vertical, etc.) being dependent upon and distinguished from the light itself.[11] On a third occasion the Sūtrakāra says that the *arūpavat* aspect is 'more powerful' (*balīyas*) because it is mentioned in a majority of Śrutis.[12] But in spite of this superiority of the *arūpavat* the Sūtrakāra does not hold that the meditation on the *arūpavat* gives a better result than that on the *rūpavat*. It is here that he differs from Śaṅkara. He clearly gives an option of choice between the two aspects and says that either of the two gives the same result, viz., Mokṣa.[13] He mentions this option twice.[14] No rational explanation can be given for this option for which of course he refers to the text of the Śruti and to *loka* (worldly experience) as the authority.[15] In the case of Śaṅkara's system the *saguṇa* may be regarded a step to the *nirguṇa* but with the Sūtrakāra the *rūpavat* is on an equal status with the *arūpavat* both being Kāraṇa aspects. The fact that the same attributes or cha-

Rūpavat on an equal status with *Arūpavat* so far as Mokṣa is concerned.

---

9 तदधीनत्वादर्थवत्। *Bra. Sū.* I. 4.3.

10 उभयव्यपदेशात्त्वहिकुण्डलवत्। *Bra. Sū.* III 2.27.

11 प्रकाशाश्रयवद्वा। *Bra. Sū.* III. 2.28.

12 लिंगभूयस्त्वात्तद्धि बलीय:। *Bra. Sū.* III. 3.44.

13 गतेरर्थवत्त्वमुभयथाऽन्यथा हि विरोध:। *Bra. Sū.* III. 3.29.

14 छन्दत उभयाविरोधात्। *Bra. Sū.* III. 3.28 and
तदपि पूर्वविकल्प: *Bra. Sū.* III. 3. 44-45.

15 श्रुत्यादिबलीयस्त्वाच्च न बाध:। *Bra. Sū.* III. 3.49 and also
उपपन्नस्तल्लक्षणार्थोपलब्धे: लोकवत्। *Bra. Sū.* III. 3.30.

F. 4

racteristics are applied by the Śruti to each of these aspects as stated above and the impossibility of making a sharp distinction between the attributes of the two, prove in the opinion of the Sūtrakāra, this option making each aspect an independent aspect of Brahman.[16]

Difference between *Rūpavat* of the Sūtrakāra and *Saguṇa* of Śaṅkara. Status of the Prajāpatiloka.

According to Śaṅkara, the *saguṇa* is Brahman (mas.) or Prajāpati and the reward of meditation on it is the attainment of the Prajāpatiloka. The Sūtrakāra does not mention this *loka* in the lists of the worlds in the *Bra. Sū.* IV. 3, but it is Śaṅkara who proposes to add the worlds of Indra and Prajāpati after that of Varuṇa.[17] We have shown that this proposal of Śaṅkara is based upon a misunderstanding of *Bra. Sū.* IV. 3.7-15. We believe that the Sūtrakāra does not take the Prajāpatiloka as Kārya of Brahman but, depending upon *Pra. Upa.* V. 5, he says that the *rūpavat* (which is in his case the Prajāpatiloka) and the *arūpavat* are each of them the *Kāraṇa Brahman itself*.[18] In another place, the Sūtrakāra clearly says that the *Puruṣa* aspect, i.e., the *rūpavat* aspect, is not liable to the fault of being (considered) a *loka*, a world, like the heaven.[19] Lastly, according to Śaṅkara, the recipient (*adhikārin*) of the *saguṇa* aspect is a seeker of a lower qualification while the best *adhikārin* is able to know and meditate on the *nirguṇa* itself. The Sūtrakāra seems to refute a view like this when he says that the Puruṣa aspect is taught not because the individual soul being encased in a body can comprehend the Puruṣa more easily than he can the *arūpavat*, since the individual soul does not necessarily exist when the body

Prajāpatiloka: No ordinary Loka

No Difference between the Adhikārins of both aspects according to the Sūtrakāra.

---

[16] तन्निर्धारणानियमस्तद्दृष्टेः पृथग्ध्यप्रतिवन्धः फलम् । *Bra. Sū.* III. 3.42.
अनुवन्धादिभ्यः प्रज्ञान्तरपृथक्त्ववद्दृष्टश्च तदुक्तम् । *Bra. Sū.* III. 3.50

[17] Vide Śaṅkara *bhāṣya* on *Bra. Sū.* IV. 3.3.

[18] विशेषं च दर्शयति । *Bra. Sū.* IV. 3-15.

[19] न सामान्यादप्युपलब्धेर्मृत्युवन्नहि लोकापत्तिः । *Bra. Sū.* III. 3.51

exsists.[20] In all these respects there is a vast difference between the Sūtrakāra and Śaṅkara regarding the relation between the two aspects in the system of each of them.

Brahman and Vidhi or Codanā.

Again, in the system of Śaṅkara the higher Brahman is above all kinds of Vedic injunctions, while according to the Sūtrakāra, Brahman which has two aspects is subject to an injunction.[21] The Sūtrakāra bases his doctrine of the identity of Brahman in all the Upaniṣads because the injunction, etc., about Brahman are the same in all of them. Moreover, the Sūtrakāra seems to us to regard the knowledge of Brahman as something (i.e. an act) to be performed (*anuṣṭheya*) and about which the Veda lays down a Vidhi.[22] According to Bādarāyaṇa the unanimity of the teaching of the two Kāṇḍas of the Veda, in fact, lies in this that both the Kāṇḍas teach something (Dharma or Brahman) which is the topic of a Vidhi or Codanā.[23]

Negative Attributes of Brahman.

With Śaṅkara the negative attributes (the neti, neti texts) describe the higher or *nirguṇa* Brahman and the Śrutis mentioning these negative attributes are in his opinion the most important ones. We have shown (in *a critique of the Brahmasūtra*) that the Sūtrakāra drops these negative qualifications of the Akṣara altogether from meditation because they are not useful for that purpose.[24] He twice mentions this uselessness

---

20 एके आत्मनः शरीरे भावात्। *Bra. Sū.* III. 3·53.
व्यतिरेकः तद्भावाभावित्वाद् न तूपलब्धिवत्। *Bra. Sū.* III. 3.54.

21 सर्ववेदान्तप्रत्ययं चोदनाद्यविशेषात्। *Bra. Sū.* III. 3.1. Vide Śaṅkara *bhāṣya* on the same.

22 अनुष्ठेयमिति बादरायणः साम्यश्रुतेः। *Bra. Sū.* III. 4.19. and
विधिर्वा धारणवत् *Bra. Sū.* III 4.20

23 तथा चैकवाक्यतोपबन्धात्। *Bra. Sū.* III. 4.24.

24 आध्यानाय प्रयोजनाभावात्। *Bra. Sū.* IIII. 3.14.

of the thoughts on the Akṣara[25] and we find that there is no Pūrvapakṣa even raised against the Sūtrakāra's view.

In the system of Śaṅkara, Brahman being somehow associated with Māyā creates the creation. The Sūtrakāra does not seem to mention Māyā at all. In our opinion, the Sūtrakāra takes Brahman alone as the cause of the creation beginning with the Ether.[26] He emphasises the *ātmakṛti* as the transformation (*pariṇāma*). There is a change but the effect (*kṛti*) is also Brahman Itself. In consistency with a change of this nature, he explains with reference to Brahman two more states, viz., vṛddhi 'increment' and hrāsa 'decrement' out of the six states mentioned by Yāska. These take place in the effects of Brahman which are also Brahman, by the self-concealment of Brahman.[27] Thus, in the system of the Sūtrakāra, no influence like that of Māyā from any outside principle or no influence of any internal power except the will of Brahman to conceal itself is responsible for these two states of the effects of Brahman (Is Māya the same as the will of Brahman?).

Śāstratva of Brahman.

With the Sūtrakāra, as with Śaṅkara, the method of the meditation on Brahman is the *ātmagṛhīti* method. The meditator contemplates on Brahman with the notion 'I am Brahman'.[28] But according to Śaṅkara the reason of this notion is the fact that Brahman itself is the inner soul, the Jīva. The Sūtrakāra seems to refute such a view about the reason of the *ātmagṛhīti* method when he says that this method is prescribed not because of the grammatical construction (*anvaya*) of the

The reason and the result of the Ātmagṛhīti method of meditation on Brahman.

[25] *Bra. Sū.* III. 3.13-15 and III. 3.33.

[26] *Bra. Sū.* II. 3.1-7.

[27] वृद्धिह्रासभाक्त्वमन्तर्भावादुभयसामञ्जस्यादेवम्। *Bra. Sū.* III. 2.20.

[28] आत्मगृहीतिरितरवदुत्तरात्। *Bra. Sū.* III. 3.16, which refers to *Bṛ. Upa.* I. 4.10. Also प्रधानवदेव तदुक्तम्। *Bra. Sū.* III. 3.43.

Śruti,[29] but rather because the Sruti makes a definite statement about the method, viz. *ātmetyevopāsīta*.[30] Again, the result (*kārya*) of this method is not the realization of the individual soul as absolutely identical with Brahman as it is the case in Śaṅkara's school, but the Sūtrakāra seems to look upon 'the all becoming' as the *kārya* mentioned in the same Sruti,[31] which he says is the Apūrva 'the Extraordinary Principle' resulting from the meditation.[32] Thus, the result of the meditation as '*ahaṃ Brahmāsmi*' is the realization by the meditator that he has been everything, Manu, and the Sun, etc. as was the experience of Vāmadeva,[33] and not that 'whatever is, is nothing but Brahman'.

Reason of inward practice of meditation.

The above form of meditation '*ahaṃ Brahmāsmi*' is to be practised within the meditator's inner-self both according to Śaṅkara and the Sūtrakāra.[35] But in Śaṅkara's philosophy this inward practice is prescribed because Brahman is the *pratyagātman*, the inner-self of man and because this identity of Brahman and the individual soul is to be realized. The Sūtrakāra, however, seems to refute such a view,[36] because according to him the inward meditation is due to the fact that the Śruti declares Brahman to be residing in the human heart and yet not to be identical with the individual soul.[37]

---

29 The *anvaya* of अथ योऽन्यां देवतामुपास्तेऽन्यासावन्योऽहमस्मीति न स वेद । *Bṛ. Upa*. I. 4.10.

30 The Sūtrakāra emphasises एव in this sentence, *Bṛ. Upa*. I. 4.7.

31 य एवं वेद ब्रह्मास्मीति स इदं सर्वं भवति। *Bṛ. Upa*. I. 4.10.

32 कार्याख्यानादपूर्वम्। *Bra. Sū*. III. 3.18

33 तद्धैतत्पश्यन्नृषिर्वामदेवः प्रतिपेदेऽहं मनुरभवँसूर्यश्चेति। *Bṛ. Upa*. I. 4.10.

34 इयदामननादन्तराभूतग्रामवत्स्वात्मनः। *Bra. Sū*. III. 3.34-35.

35 अन्यथाऽभेदानुपपत्तिरिति चेन्न....। *Bra. Sū*. III. 3.36

36 Cf. इयदामननात्, in *Bra. Sū*. III 3.34-35.

37 Cf. उपदेशान्तरवत् in *Bra. Sū*. III. 3.36 which seems to refer to such Śruti as द्वा सुपर्णा सयुजा सखाया...।

Brahman as the giver of Mokṣa.

According to Śaṅkara, Brahman is the giver of the fruits of our everyday actions and perhaps in his system Brahman cannot be looked upon as the giver of the fruit in the form of Mokṣa, but the Sūtrakāra is clear about his opinion in this matter.[38]

Progressive saṁpatti, utkrānti and gati of the seeker of Brahman.

We have shown[39] that according to the Sūtrakāra a union (*saṁpatti*) of the senses, the mind, the vital airs, the soul and the subtle elements takes place in the case of a seeker of Brahman ever since he begins the search of Brahman which is carried out on the Path (*sṛti*) of the gods (*devayāna*) *till* he does not get Immortality.[39] But when he attains Immortality and departs from the body for the last time (never to be reborn here once again), the union, (*saṁpatti*) of all these ending with the subtle element *in the Para* residing in the heart takes place. This union is of the nature of non-separation.[41] And the whole group leaves the body being helped by the Para residing in the heart through the hundred-and-first artery.[42] He joins the rays of the sun and, travelling on the Path of gods, comes to the world of Lightning from where this knower of Brahman is conducted to his Destination, the Para by the Vaidyuta Ātivāhika. All this is quite unlike Śaṅkara's doctrine on the same questions.

As regards the state of Mokṣa the Sūtrakāra seems to hold that the fruit in the form of Mokṣa is the attainment of Brahman itself,[43] but as we have seen this state is

---

[38] फलमतः उपपत्तेः। *Bra. Sū.* III. 2.38.

[39] ममाना चासृत्युपक्रमादमृतत्वं चानुपोष्य। *Bra. Sū.* IV. 2.7.

[39a] *A Critique of the Brahmasūtra : Part I.*

[40] तानि परे तथाह्याह। *Bra. Sū.* IV. 2.15.

[41] अविभागो वचनात्। *Bra. Sū.* IV. 2.16.

[42] -हार्दानुगृहीतः शताधिकया in *Bra. Sū.* IV. 2. 17.

[43] पूर्वं तु बादरायणो हेतुव्यपदेशात्। *Bra. Sū.* III. 24.1.

attained by the knower of Brahman reaching Brahman. As Brahman is at the same time *rūpavat* and *arūpavat* the mukta Ātman may have a body or may not have it, says the Sūtrakāra. In the former case he is able to experience *a divine enjoyment*[44] the presence of which, as we have seen above, does not make the attainment of Brahman the same as the attainment of a world (*loka*), since this enjoyment is the only point of similarity between a world (*loka*) and Brahman, there being complete difference in all other respects. The mukta Ātman resides in this *union* with Brahman which is of the nature of *non-separation* from Brahman.[45] He lives in this state eternally; this state of liberation is not affected by creation and dissolution which do effect our world;[46] the Śruti describes the *sthiti* continuation or permanence but not the creation (*sṛṣṭi*) and dissolution (*pralaya*) of the state of the mukta.[47] Thus, the Sūtrakāra's doctrine of the state of liberation is also different from that of Śaṅkara. In the former, the liberated soul continues his individuality and experiences a state of enjoyment; in the latter he merges into Brahman.

State of Mukti. Option of Body. Divine Enjoyment Permanent State of Non-Separation from Brahman.

There are other points of difference between Śaṅkara and the Sūtrakāra which we have noticed elsewhere in their proper places. Both hold that *jñāna* is not subsidiary to *karman* as a means to Mokṣa, but they differ as to the place of *karman* in the attainment of Mokṣa. According to the Sūtrakāra two kinds of *karmans* must be done by a seeker of Brahman as a help to the

Relative position of Jñāna and Karman.

44 *Bra. Sū.* IV 4.10-12, 21.

45 अविभागेन दृष्टत्वात्। *Bra. Sū.* IV. 4.4.

46 जगद्व्यापारवर्जम्। *Bra. Sū.* IV. 4.17.

47 तथा हि स्थितिमाह। *Bra. Sū.* IV 4.19.

48 अधिकोपदेशात्तु बादरायणस्यैवम्। *Bra. Sū.* III. 3.8.

49 सर्वथाऽपि त एवोभयलिंगात्। *Bra. Sū.* III. 4.34.

knowledge of Brahman in achieving Mokṣa.[50] The first kind of such helping actions are the sacrifice, donation and penance[51] and the Sūtrakāra insists that they must be done by a seeker even though the seeker may be possessed of the mental peace (*śama*), self-control (*dama*), etc.[52] But as we have shown Śaṅkara gives such an interpretation to the Sūtra in question that he concludes that a seeker may not perform the sacrifice, etc., but he must perform (?) the *śama*, *dama*, etc. since they are laid down as means to the knowledge of Brahman. Apart from the difference in the interpretation of the Sūtra, we make this note here only to show where the two Ācāryas differ. The other group of actions to be done as a help by a seeker according to the Sūtrakāra is the group of *āśrama karmans* the duties of one's own order of life, e.g., *agnihotra*, etc.[53] Śaṅkara clearly says that these actions do not help the knowledge of Brahman in the achievement of Mokṣa, but they are *means only to the appearance or rise of the knowledge* which alone brings Mokṣa.[54] Perhaps the Sūtrakāra holds that even the voluntary (kāmya) duties help the knowledge in the attainment of Mokṣa.[55] The Sūtrakāra's attitude about

Two kinds of Karman help Jñāna.

---

50 सहकारित्वेन च। *Bra. Sū.* III. 4. 33 and अग्निहोत्रादि तु तत्कार्यायैव तद्दर्शनात्। *Bra. Sū.* IV 1.16.

51 These are prescribed in *Bṛ. Upa.* IV. 4.22.

52 तस्मादेवं विच्छान्तो दान्त उपरतस्तितिक्षुः समाहितो भूत्वात्मन्येवात्मानं पश्यति। *Br. Upa.* IV. 4.23. And शमदमाद्युपेतः स्यात्तथापि तु तद्विधेस्तदंगतया तेषामवश्यानुष्ठेयत्वम्। *Bra. Sū.* III. 4.33.

53 विहितत्वाच्चाश्रमकर्मापि। *Bra. Sū.* III. 4.32 and सहकारित्वेन च। *Bra. Sū.* III. 4.33.

54 न चेदं विद्यासहकारित्ववचनमाश्रमकर्मणां प्रयाजादिवद्विद्याफलविषयं मन्तव्यम्। अविधिलक्षणत्वाद्विद्यायाः। असाध्यत्वाच्च विद्याफलस्य। ... तस्मादुत्पत्तिसाधनत्व एवैषां सहकारित्ववाचोयुक्तिः Śā-*bhāṣya* on *Bra. Sū.* III. 4.33 And also ननु अनारभ्यो मोक्षः, कथमस्य कर्मकार्यत्वमुच्यते? नैष दोषः। आरादुपकारकत्वात् कर्मणः। ज्ञानस्यैव हि प्रापकं सत्कर्म प्रणाड्या मोक्षकारणमित्युपचर्यते। *Śā-bhāṣya* on *Bra Sū.* IV. 1.16.

55 Vide our Interpretation of अतोऽन्यापि ह्येकेषाम्। *Bra. Sū.* IV. 1.17.

these good deeds as a help to Mokṣa is clear from the fact that while the Sūtrakāra holds that *only on the fall of the body* a seeker who has already attained the knowledge of Brahman is freed from the contact with good deeds[56] and that therefore there is no destruction (*vināśa*) of good deeds on the rise of the knowledge; Śaṅkara by unjustifiable additions to the Sūtra in question tries to bring out of it his own view that on the attainment of the knowledge the good deeds (at least the past ones) of a jñānin are destroyed. The absence of contact (*asaṁśleṣa*—in *Bra. Sū.* IV1.14) only means that they do not give him their ordinary reward, viz., the heaven or any other object of desire after his departure from this world. Thus, the Sūtrakāra seems to mean that the good deeds done by a jñānin before the attainment of the jñāna and continued to be done by him even after its attainment help the knowledge in the achievement of its goal but do not give the *jñānin* the usual reward. He appears to ask even the *jñānin* to continue to do the good deeds (both compulsory and voluntary) as a help to his *jñāna till he departs* from the body.[57] In Śaṅkara's system there is no scope for these good deeds being performed till the end of the body even after the attainment of the knowledge, because according to him the knowledge means the knowledge that the soul is no agent.[58] Śaṅkara takes special care to show that in *Bra. Sū.* IV. 1. 16[59] the Sūtrakāra mentions the good deeds which the *jñānin* has already done before the attainment of the knowledge as being converted into a help to the knowledge, and that the Sūtrakāra does not say that the good deeds which a *jñānin* does after the attainment of knowledge

The Sūtrakāra and Śaṅkara about "Good deeds" and Jñāna of Brahman.

No destruction of merits of a seeker of Brahman.

56 इतरस्याप्येवमसंश्लेषः पाते तु। *Bra. Sū.* IV. 1.14.

57 इतरस्याप्येवमसंश्लेषः पाते तु। *Bra. Sū.* IV. 1.14.

58 Vide Śaṅkara *bhāṣya* on *Bra. Sū.* IV. 1.14 and also on IV. 1.16.

59 अग्निहोत्रादि तु तत्कार्यायैव तद्दर्शनात्। *Bra. Sū.* IV. 1.16.

helps the knowledge for a common goal.[60] This rather makes one believe that the Sūtrakāra actually prescribes the good deeds even after *jñānaprāpti*.

The above discussion also shows that according to the Sūtrakāra there is no liberation in this life (*jīvanmukti*) such as there is in Śaṅkara's system.[61] According to the Sūtrakāra the most perfect state to be attained on this earth is that of comparative sinlessness.

Nature of Knowledge of Brahman: Anuṣṭheya and Vidhi.

Though the Sūtrakāra and Śaṅkara agree that the knowledge is not dependent upon the *karman* for the achievement of Mokṣa, they differ as regards the nature of the knowledge just as they differ about the nature of the help that *karman* renders to the knowledge. The Sūtrakāra takes the *jñāna* as something to be performed (*anuṣṭheya*) and as the subject of an Injunction;[62] But Śaṅkara does not take the knowledge of Brahman as laid down by a Vidhi.[63]

Order of Life of a seeker of Brahman.

In the opinion of the Sūtrakāra a seeker of Mokṣa may belong to any of the four orders of life, though he may take to the ascetic order even from the order of religious studentship[64]. He says that a seeker of Brahman who is outside the order of asceticism may do the duties of his caste because the Smṛti asks him to do them and because there is a practice of doing them among the seekers of Mokṣa in the Upani-

---

60 अत एव चातिक्रान्तविषयमेतत्कार्यँकत्वाभिधानम्। न हि ब्रह्मविद आगाम्यग्निहोत्रादि संभवति। *Śā. bhāṣya* on *Bra. Sū.* IV 1·16.

61 'The *jīvanmukti* is not described also in *Bra. Sū.* III. 4. 51 though Śaṅkara takes ऐहिक in that Sūtra as ऐहिकमपि विद्याजन्म भवति। Vide our interpretation.

62 अनुष्ठेयं बादरायणः साम्यश्रुतेः। *Bra. Sū.* III. 4.19 and विधिर्वा धारणवत्। *Bra. Sū.* III. 4.20.

63 अविधिलक्षणत्वाच्च विद्यायाः। Śaṅkara *bhasya on Bra. Sū.* III. 4. 33.

64 विहितत्वाच्चाश्रमकर्मापि। *Bra. Sū.* III. 4.32. Vide our interpretation of *Bra. Sū.* III. 4.36-39.

ṣads[65]. The actions thus done by a seeker do not bind him because their reward goes to his master. Particularly, a Brāhmaṇa seeker who is a householder may do his priestly duties because these can be sold to his master. A householder seeker has also to do by way of help to the knowledge several other deeds over and above the two sets of works noticed above.[66] He has to collect all the duties prescribed by the Upaniṣads as a help to the knowledge for the attainment of Mokṣa, because he does not lack those conveniences which a student, a hermit or an ascetic who is a seeker, cannot possess.[67] A householder trying to get the knowledge of Brahman may do even worldly duties in order that the deeds he has already begun may not be obstructed.[68] Thus, according to the Sūtrakāra a seeker of liberation may be a member of *any one* of the four orders of life. But, as is well known, Śaṅkara insists on his belonging only to the ascetic order.

Stricter Rules for a householder seeker.

We have given above most of points of agreement and difference between the Sūtrakāra and Śaṅkara, that we come across in *Bra. Sū.* III. 2. 11—IV. They show that between the two Ācāryas there is an essential difference about the nature of Brahman, the creation, the individual soul, the knowledge of Brahman, the utility of the good deeds in the attainment of Mokṣa and the *adhikārin* of Mokṣa. Both of them differ also about the nature of the relation of the Jñānakāṇḍa and Karmakāṇḍa of the Veda. Śaṅkara does not believe that *dharmajijñāsā* is the immediate prerequisite of *brahmajijñāsā*. He seems to hold that the Karmakāṇḍa *has no independent goal* to achieve and that the goal of the Jñānakāṇḍa is in no way

65 वहिस्तूभयथापि स्मृतेराचाराच्च। (*Bra. Sū.* III. 4. 43).

66 Vide Notes (49)-(50) *supra*.

67 कृत्स्नभावात्तु गृहिणोपसंहारः। *Bra. Sū.* III. 4.38.

68 ऐहिकमप्यप्रस्तुतप्रतिबन्धे तद्दर्शनात्। *Bra. Sū.* *III.* 4.51.

concerned with a Vidhi of the Veda just as the Dharma, the goal of the Karmakāṇḍa, is. Thus,

Relation of the two Kāṇḍas of the Veda.

according to Śaṅkara there is no possibility of a unanimity of the teaching (*ekavākyatā*) of the two Kāṇḍas. But, the Sūtrakāra holds that the goals of both the Kāṇḍas are *laid down by the* respective Vidhis (Yajeta; jijñāsīta) and that both have their respective Apūrvas and in this way there is an essential *ekavākyatā* 'unanimity of sense and purpose' of the two Kāṇḍas[69] so that they could belong to the same scripture viz. Śruti or Veda.

We would repeat that the present paper is being submitted to the scholars only as a part of the proposed inter-

This comparison and these conclusions are only tentative.

pretation of the *Brahmasūtra* and is therefore tentative both in its conclusions which may be revised on a further study, and that therefore, the comparative statement about the systems of the Sūtrakāra and Śaṅkara presented here may be read with caution and must be accepted after a careful examination.

---

69 एवं चैकवाक्योपनिबन्धात्। *Bra. Sū.* III. 4·24.

THE ṚGVEDIC PRINCIPLES OF LITERARY CRITICISM

By PROF. P. S. SASTRI

(i)

THE Ṛgveda affords a fruitful field of Aesthetic investigation. These pages are an attempt at presenting the literary theories held by the Ṛgvedic poets. The theories are reconstructed from what has been left in the poetic utterances of the seers. One might contend that the literary or Aesthetic interpretation of the *Ṛgveda* cannot be taken seriously since it has not been vouchsafed to us by Indian tradition which has been zealously guarding the vedic literature from an immemorial antiquity. It is enough to reply that Yāska refers to four distinct schools of Vedic interpretation and to seventeen interpreters themselves. He was faced in his own day by the Yājñikas like Kautsa who cared for the letter and not for the spirit; his collection of homonyms reveals the great lapse between the first interpretation of the Veda and his own. Therefore, Yāska does not represent the original school of Vedic interpretation but only one of the latter schools. And what Indian tradition offers us now is the school that came into existence with Yāska, namely, the Mīmāṁsaka school.

The Ṛgvedic poets held their compositions to be poetry of a high order. They had distinct theories of Poetry and Fine Art. They were keenly alive to the various literary forms, like the ballad, the lyric, the monologue, the soliloquy and the drama. They realised the value of Imagery and employed it freely. They had their own theories concerning the various literary forms. Besides they had their theories of Rasa and Dhvani. It is not only a theory of Art that they had, but they also put it into exe-

cution. At the same time they demanded of a work of Art certain excellences. In short, they were critics and Poets at the same time. The seers had definite Principles of literary criticism as can be seen from the remarks they pass every now and then.

It has become customary to speak that the theories of literary criticism, like Rasa, Dhvani, Guṇa, Alaṅkāra, Rīti, Vakrokti, Vyakti, and Aucitya, sprang into existence only in the age of classical Sanskrit Literature and Culture. All these eight vādas find a harmony in the expositions given by Ānandavardhana, Abhinavagupta and Jagannātha. Hence, if the theories of Rasa and Dhvani are said to exist in the Ṛgvedic literature, it goes without saying that the other principles of literary criticism too were in vogue. We can build up a complete theory of literary criticism accepted and enunciated by the Ṛgvedic poets.

(ii)

The Ṛgvedic seers frequently observe that they are singing as old, that their songs are modelled after those of the ancients, and that theirs are still new. Angirasas[1], Māndhātṛ[2], Atri[3], Jāmadagni[4], Kaṇva[5], Nabhāka[6], Kāvya-uśanas[7], are some of the ancient poets[8] whom they have accepted as their patterns or models. At the same time we know that the song of Trita (1.105) has been remodelled by Kutsa whence it carries the Kutsa refrain. These state-

[1] Navyam angirasvad arcata 2.17.1.

[2] Evendrāgnibhyām pitṛvan navīyo Mandhātṛvad angirasvad avāci 8.40.12. cf. 10.66.14.

[3] Atrivan namasā gṛṇānaḥ 5.4.9. cf. 5.72.1; 8.35.19.

[4] Gṛṇānā Jamadagninā 3.62.18.

[5] Giraḥ Śumbhāmi Kaṇvavat 8.6.11.

[6] Pra brahmāṇi nabhākavad.....irajyata 8.40.5.

[7] Pra kāvyam uśaneva bruvāṇa'ḥ 9.92.7.

[8] Anuṣṭuvanti pūrvathā 8.3.8; 8.15.6; cf. 9.43.2.

ments clearly emphasise that the songs of the ancients have a permanent value in that they were able to inspire the poets. That is, the ancients are the poets' poets; in the language of Vālmīki,—"Param Kavīnām ādhāram" (1.4.21). Since the ancients are the poets of poets, the makers of poets, or the pure poets, there arose later on the doctrine that the subject matter or the plot of a work of Art must be a well-known one preserved in some itihāsa or other—"Prasiddham iti Vṛttam". The Ṛgvedic poets were conscious of the fact that a Great Poem requires a proper plot which should be possible or probable. Such a one is vouchsafed to us in the work of the ancients which can be conveniently called an 'Itihāsa Purāṇa' along with Geldner and Sieg[9].

At the same time it does not mean that the poetic composition is to be a patchy imitation. The seers emphasise the fact that their compositions are fresh and new[10]. This means that the poetic theme might be a familiar one. But the worth of a poem lies not so much in the familiarity or otherwise of the subject matter of a poem, but in the way one approaches it, comprehends it, realises it, and handles it. The poetic fact is simple enough. And if we were to insist on the significance of the poetic fact or matter alone, we are passing from poetry to philosophy; for, there is only a slight difference between a poet and a philosopher. Both must have the intuitive apprehension

---

[9] Geldner: Vedische Studien.

Sieg: Sagen Stoffe des Rigveda.

[10] Sūktena vacasā navena 2.18.3

Navyam kṛṇomi sanyase purājām 3.31.19.

Navyam atakṣad brahma 1.62.13.

Naviṣṭhayā matī 1.82.2; 8.25.24.

Stomam janayāmi navyam 1.101.2.

See also 6.18.15; 6.50.6; 7.7.6; 7.15.4; 7.36.14; 7.53.2; 7.61.6; 7.33.1; 8.40.12; 9.9.8; 10.4.6; 10.91.13; etc.

of the Real; but this apprehension, or Tattvadarśana, or the realisation of the inner meaning, must be revealed through a language[11]. It must be clothed in Expression[12]. That is, the poetic spirit is beyond the Empirical facts or Spatio-temporal universe as embodied in Reason. It is the world of Imagination. This imagination is not the negation of Reason, but the source of Reason[13]. Consequently the poetic world gives rise to the empirical world[14]. Hence does Socrates observe that an individual is the true citizen of his city of which the pattern is laid in Heaven, and only conditionally on earth[15].

The significant feature or the characteristic of a work of Art lies in its imaginative or intuitive apprehension of the fact. This apprehension makes it new, whence does it enter the world as a powerful force[16]. The novelty pertains to this winnowing activity of imagination. Therefore, the Ṛgvedic poets often observe that their pattern or subject matter is ancient but their presentation is new. This is the fundamental principle of literary criticism prevalent during the Ṛgvedic age.

(iii)

Poetry, said Coleridge, is the best words in the best order; and there are Ālaṅkārikās who insist on embellishments. There are passages in the *Ṛgveda* bringing forth thisaspect of Poetry in a different way. We read: "Giraḥ Śumbhanti Pūrvathā (9.43.2). The Soma is decorated or embellished by the songs. The Soma is the subject of

[11] *Tanta* Bhaṭṭa.

[12] Croce: *Aesthetic.*

[13] Bradley: *Essays on Truth and Reality*; Bosanquet: *Meeting of Extremes.*

[14] *Nāṭya-Śāstra*, 1.117 and *Abhinavabhāratī.*

[15] Plato: *Republic* IX.

[16] Bradley: *Oxford Lectures on Poetry.*

the poem". "Giraḥ śumbhāmi kaṇvavat" (8.6.11). Indra is to be approached with embellished songs. That is, Poetry for one meant embellishing the subject matter; and for another it is the ornamentation of the form. The worth of a poem does not lie in the formal decoration, for the spirit of Poetry is always beautiful; and as Kālidāsa said, the Poetic Spirit transmutes everything into Beauty[17]. Moreover, the spirit of Poetry makes even the ornaments look Beautiful[18]. When the Ṛgvedic poets speak of ornamentation, they do not refer to the external Alaṅkāras. They only mean that the subject matter selected by a poet should be Beautiful, or it should be presented as Beautiful.

One seer observes that a 'pure song' has come into existence then;

"Śucim nu Stomans nava jātam adya". Here by 'pure' (Śucim), the Ṛgvedic poet only emphasises its poetic quality. He eschews all idea of external embellishments. Similarly another declares;

"Pra śukraitu devī manīṣāsmat" (7.34.1). The poetic thought (manīṣā) is lustrous or beautiful (śukra). It is not the alaṅkāra that he insists upon, but the content which can make even the alaṅkāra beautiful. And this poetic thought is always to appear as new and fresh. As Māgha observed[19], Beauty is that which constantly appears new; and this is an essential principle of poetic criticism. Hence does one poet speak of 'Naviṣṭhayā mati'[20]; that is, the poetic thought is the newest. By this he only means that originality and freshness are the essential features of a

---

[17] "Yad yat sādhu na citre syāt kriyate tat tad anyathā"—Śākuntala 6.

[18] Cf. "Kim iva hi madhurāṇām maṇḍanam nākṛtīnām"—Śākuntala 1.

[19] "Kṣaṇe kṣaṇe yan navatām upaiti
tadeva rūpam ramaṇīyatāyāḥ" (Śiśupālavadha).

[20] 1.82.2; 8.25.24.

work of Art. These qualities belong not to the form alone, but to the matter. This newness is always to be in relation to its execution; "Akāri te harivo brahma navyamdhiyā" (1.16.21). This does mean that at every moment the poet has a newer, a richer, a fuller, and a more significant experience. He feels a wider and broader outlook on life. Consequently the poet's self becomes expansive and all inclusive. He is able to let go his personality. Unless the poet loses his personality in that of the others, he cannot give us magnificient works of art.

At the same time simplicity of expression is essential, "Ayā vardhasva tanvā girā mama" (8.1.18). The poet should not run after the obscure and the farfetched expressions. The words he selects must be too common. He must have the poetic perception to understand the significance of words so that he might use the proper word at the proper place. In other words, the expression of the poet should be faultless.

"Giro yasminn anavadyāḥ samīcīḥ" (3.31.13). This is the 'Doṣa rāhitya' of the Rhetoricians of classical Sanskrit. When the words are 'Anavadya' or faultless, there will be the propriety or Aucitya in poetry. As such Aucitya in expression should not be lost sight of by a Poet; for Anaucitya alone can put an end to the Rasaniṣpatti[21].

One poet speaks of the poetic thought as the glorious one of brilliancy; "Śucipeśasam dhiyam" (1.144.1). Purity or Loftiness itself is the decoration for the poetic thought. It requires no further figures of speech. This thought is again said to be, "Śukra Varṇam" (1.143.7). It is robed in glowing lustres or colours which constitute its bright garments so to say. The song is as lustrous as the flames of Agni !

"Agneḥ śocir na didyutaḥ"[22].

---

[21] "Anaucityād ṛte nānyad rasabhangasya kāraṇam" (*Dhvanyāloka* 3.).

[22] 8.6.7.

The flames of Agni are not only natural to Fire, but also inherent in it; they constitute fire. In the same way, the poetic thought or wisdom—"Vipām agreṣu dhītayaḥ"[23] —is its own ornament. It does not require any external embellishment. It has an inherent Beauty which can be compared, in the words of Ānandavardhana, to the 'Lāvaṇya' in women. There should, therefore, be Beauty not only in the execution of the poetic idea and experience, but also in the poetic conception itself (7.34.1).

(iv)

The poetic thought, says the Vedic poet, should be truthful.

"Codayatam sūnṛtāḥ pinvatam dhiya
Ut purandhīr īrayatam tad uśmasi"[24]

It is neither the imitation of life, nor an idealisation, that a poet should endeavour to present. He should present life in such a way that it would be both an interpretation and a criticism of life. Then alone the empirical fact as winnowed by the poetic imagination can enter the universe as a mighty power. Hence does the Ṛgvedic poet constantly refer to the poem as great and powerful.

"Indram giro bṛhatir abhy anūṣata"[25]
"Bṛhatī manīṣā"[26]

This great or powerful song should also be all-pervading. It should interpret life as a whole and, therefore, represent the spirit of the Age (Zeit-Geist) :

"Iyam manīṣā bṛhatī bṛhanto-
rukramā tavasā vardhayantī"[27]

[23] 8.6.7.

[24] 10.39.2.

[25] 3.51.1.

[26] 6.49.4.

[27] 7.99.6.

Then alone can it be auspicious : "Matibhiḥ śivābhiḥ"[28]. Consequently, a poem should be both pious and excellent. "Maṅhiṣṭhābhir matibhiḥ"[29]. Therefore does Poetry become sacred.

A great poem should have and will have this sanctity, because it is the expression of a vital urge under the stress of inspiration. Inspiration is always the work of a suprasensuous force. And during the inspired mood, the poet becomes a medium of revelation[30]. As such the poem is sacred. It is a song given by God "Devattam brahma"[31]. The seer sings with divine thought[32]—"Gṛṇanto devyā dhiyā"[33]. Even the words are divine: "Vacasā daivyena"[34]. These poetic thoughts are always directed towards Ṛta, the spiritual and moral principle in the universe. This is the true subject matter of all poetry. And a poem should be judged from this standpoint alone.

(v)

The songs are, therefore, powerful and new from the standpoint of thought :

"Pra tavyasīm navyasīm dhītim"[35]

They must abound in choice phrases also (acchoktibhiḥ). This is possible only when the thought is purified and embellished :

"Pra śundhyuvam varuṇāya preṣṭhām
matim vasiṣṭha mīḷahuṣe bharasva"[36]

---

[28] 10.67.9.

[29] 8.23.23.

[30] See *Quarterly Journal of Mythic Society* for the present writer's article on Rigvedic Theory of Inspiration.

[31] 1.37.4.

[32] See also 3.18.3; 4.43.1; 7.34.1; 7.34.9.

[33] 8.27.13.

[34] 4.1.15. Cf. 3.24.4 : "*Mahayā giraḥ.*"

[35] 1.143.1.

[36] 7.88.1.

Such a pure song, a song which is unadulterated and unsophisticated, should come forth spontaneously. Poetry should come as naturally as leaves to a tree[37]. A poet observes :

"Vaiśvānarāya matir navyasī śuciḥ
Soma iva pavate cārur agnaye"[38]

The new and pure song rushes forth naturally and spontaneously just like the pleasant Soma to Agni. Hence according to the Vedic seers Poetry is the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings.

The song itself should have as its matter something that is felt sincerely by the poet's heart[39]. The poem is to be carved out in the heart :

"Imam svasmai hṛda ā sutaṣṭam mantram vocema
kuvid asya vedat"[40]

—It is carved out in the heart after it was well thought out (Mantram).

"Hṛdi spṛśo manasā vacyamānāḥ"[41]

It touches the heart, it is felt in the heart and along the blood[42]. But still the mind too has an important role in the composition of a poem. The poem does not represent only a pure experience. It is not simple experience of a pure feeling. It involves the play of thought of understanding, for the Aesthetic act is not one of feeling alone, but of feeling in unity with thought[43]. Thus it is said,

"Vidantīm atra naro dhiyam dhā
hṛdā yat taṣṭān mantrān aśaṁsan"[44]

---

[37] John Keats : *Letters*.

[38] 6.8.1.

[39] Manīṣā 3.33.5, Mantram. (1.74.1), See 1.88.6.

[40] 2.35.2.

[41] 10.47.7.

[42] Wordsworth : *Tintern Abbey*.

[43] Cf. "Vijñānena lalitena yojayata"—*Mālavikāgnimitra* 2.13.

[44] 1.67.2.

The songs or poetic thoughts are carved out of the heart[45]. But still it is not actual carving out, for that means giving shape to a crude material. On the other hand, the poetic thought consists of many feelings and ideas which are fused together:

> "Vyūrṇoti hṛdā matim
> navyo jāyatāmṛtam"[46]

The poet weaves his thoughts through his heart. That is, a great poem represents the unification of the Intellect and the Heart. Therefore a poem is to be judged both from the affective and the intellectual standpoints. It should appeal to the senses, heart and mind, all at the same time. It is to be, therefore, simple sweet and sensuous[47] (i.e., finite). It must breathe the suggestive atomosphere.

(vi)

A poem is not simply the clothing of an Idea or thought. It is not purely intellectual, for then it will pass into Philosophy. Nor is it purely an expression of mystic consciousness, for it is not an epitome of Religion. A poem is not a mataphysical deduction, nor a moral postulate. · It includes both and yet is different from them, for it does not posit an unbridgeable gulf between the empirical and the spiritual. It has "Kāntāsammitatva"[48]; it provides Lokottarānanda[49] or transcendental bliss, spiritual ecstacy, transport. The Ṛgvedic poets were conscious of this purpose of Art. And yet they do not mean that pure, undifferentiated bliss is the End of Art; for according to them bliss is always inseparable from thought.

---

[45] Cf. 1.171.2.

[46] 1.105.15.

[47] Milton's definition of Poetry.

[48] Cf. *Locana*, *Kāvyaprakāśa* and *Pratāparudrīya*.

[49] Cf. *Locana*, *Abhinavabhāratī*, *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, and *Rasagaṅgādhara*.

One seer observes in the fifth Maṇḍala:

"Ya ṛṣvā ṛṣṭividyutaḥ kavayaḥ santi vedhasaḥ
tam ṛṣe mārutam gaṇam namasyā ramayā girā"[50]

The poet is a seer, a creative artist. He expresses his obligation to the deity through the poetic expression which is delightful (Ramayā). Another says:

"Ā te vatso mano yamat paramāc cit sadhasthāt
agne tvām kāmayā girā"[51]

The poetic speech is pleasant or interesting (Kāmayā) since it fully expresses the seer's longings. Hence a third one speaks :

"Imā utvā paspṛdhānāso atra
mandrā giro devayantīr upa sthuḥ"[52]

The words compete with one another. The poet should care to see that the proper word alone is employed. As Yeats said, "the poem is the result of the poet quarrelling with himself". When the proper word is selected, the song vibrates after its object (devayantīḥ), it leads us to the true object of experience by way of suggestion. Hence it is benign and delightful. It is "Mandrā"; for as another said:

"Yad vāg vadanty avicetanāni
rāṣṭrī devānām nīṣasāda mandrā"[53]

Expression not only distinguishes the objects, but also interpretes (Vadanti) the inner significance of the external objects (avicetanāni); for, speech is the delightful queen ruling the immortals. These immortals, from a Philosophic and Aesthetic standpoint, are Truth, Beauty and Goodness. Such a powerful speech is divine, is created by the Gods

---

[50] 5.52.13.

[51] 8.11.7.

[52] 7.18.3.

[53] 8.100.10.

as one. Though we apprehend the words in manifold ways, yet they suggest only one Reality:

> "Sā no mandreṣam ūrjam duhānā
> dhenur vāg asmān upa suṣṭutaitu"[54]

This poetic expression is a cow (dhenu), or in the words of Daṇḍin, "gauḥ gauḥ kāmadhuk"[55]. The cow gives not only sweet and delicious milk, but also energy besides providing an atmosphere of Beauty. In the same way the poetic expression yields not only a meaning, but also a suggestion of the inner Reality, the Reality that underlies the Actual[56].

The poetic expression, therefore, is the sweetest :

> "Tubhy edam agne madhumattamam vacas
> tubhyam manīṣā iyam astu śam hṛde
> tvām giraḥ sindhun ivāvanīr
> mahīrā pṛṇanti śavasā vardhayanti ca"[57]

The poem is the sweetest. It is auspicious. And yet it is thought in itself. Like the waters of a river, do the words please the object by unfolding it.

> "Idam pitre marutām ucyate vacaḥ
> svādoḥ svādīyo rudrāya vardhanam"[58]

The poem is the most delightful among the delightful and pleasant objects. And this feature of spiritual ecstasy or transcendental bliss reveals itself only when it suggests the Reality and renders possible the spiritual communion. Consequently, a poetic composition should conform to the theories of Rasa and Dhvani[59], when alone it can be "Kāntāsammita" yielding "Sadyaḥ para-nirvṛti."

---

[54] 8.100.11.

[55] *Kāvyādarśa.*

[56] Cf. Carlyle : *The Hero as a Man of Letters.*

[57] 5.11.5.

[58] 1.114.6.

[59] See the present writer's article in *Poona Orientalist*, 1945.

(vii)

A great poem is always the outcome or expression of a spiritual sacrifice. The penetrative imagination should be aided by the contemplative imagination. This necessarily presupposes a conflict, a great stress, "Sturm und Drang". As Yeats said, the poet quarrels with himself. The spatio-temporal personality collides with the Transcendental Reality. As a result of the spiritual sacrifice the great poet achieves perfection in his "samādhi" and apprehends himself as one with the coherent system of Reality. So the Ṛgvedic poets speak of the poem as the product of sacrifice :

"Uktham navīyo janayasva yajñaiḥ"[60]
The poem is born anew out of the sacrifice.
"Samiddham agnim samidhā girā gṛṇe"[61]

The poetic expression too is purified by sacrifice and concentration and contemplation. As Kālidāsa observed, Samādhi is essential for a work of art. If there is "Śithila Samādhi", then the resulting Aesthetic creation will be "Kāntivisamvāda"[62].

"Yajñena vācaḥ padavīyam āyan
tām anv avindann ṛṣiṣu praviṣṭām
tām ā bhṛtyā vyadadhuḥ purutrā
tām sapta rebhā abhi sam navante"[63]

The seers discovered the aesthetic expression through contemplation and sacrifice; consequently there is purity. It is lofty. But this speech entered the universe only through the seven metres. That is, for poetic expression Metre is absolutely essential. The sound should echo the sense. And the sense should have a proper medium for

[60] 6.18.15.
[61] 6.15.7.
[62] *Mālavikāgnimitra* 2.2.
[63] 10.71.3

revealing itself. This constitutes the "Bhāva-lāvaṇya-yojana" or the synthesis of content and form, which is a cardinal principle of literary criticism. Hence it is said:

"Anuṣṭubhaṃ anu carcūryamāṇam
indraṁ ni cikyuḥ kavayo manīṣā"[64]

In their poetic thoughts thé poets have looked on Indra swiftly approaching when Anuṣṭubh calls him. On the one hand Metre is essential to a poem. And on the other the content of the poem achieves a synthetic unity (ananyatva) with its form.

(viii)

The appreciation of Poetry does not involve the discursive thought alone. Thought can at best suggest the deeper harmonies and the vital principle[65]. It is the final impression or the total impression that counts. If one fails to apprehend this final or ultimate impression, his understanding of poetry is faulty[66]. Therefore, a proper appreciation of poetry depends upon the intuitive apprehension (preṇā) of the sahṛdaya[67]. He should sift the appearances and commune with the underlying spirit of poetry[68]. It is only to such a sahṛdaya does a Poem unmask her beauty like a well-dressed, loving beloved to her lover[69]. Consequently the critic who runs after expression and begins to analyse it alone, is one who wanders in profitless illusion since he does not understand even the poetic expression[70]; he is even a female weaver[71]. The

[64] 10.124.9.
[65] 1.164.37.
[66] 1.164.39.
[67] 10.71.1.
[68] 10.71.2.
[69] 10.71.4.
[70] 10.71.5.
[17] 10.71.9.

unity of impression is, therefore, more fundamental in a peom; and the poem should be judged only with reference to such a standard.

The critic as such has to fulfil certain conditions if he were to comprehend the total impression. He should be like the Suparṇā which enjoys the fruit of the tree of knowledge[72]; for, then alone can his eyes and ears be properly rewarded[73]. Whatever he hears or sees will be of great aesthetic significance. For him who is ignorant of the power of suggestion in words, poetry will be useless[74]. This is possible only for one who has the intuitive apprehension of the Real[75]. The Sahṛdaya alone is fully alive to the power of suggestion to the actual meanings of words. "The wise in spirit have fashioned language like men cleansing corn-flows in a sieve. Only those who have their nature and outlook apprehend the communion with the inner significance for, in their speech, there lies the treasure"[76]. Thus the Sahṛdaya should know all the Vṛttis; but at the same time he should realise the supremacy of vyañjanā. He too is on a par with the poet. As the poet undergoes spiritual conflict, as the poet experiences spiritual sacrifice, so does the critic too. There is little or no difference between a poet and his critic in the ultimate sense. Both aim at the same goal, though in different ways. Ṛgvedic Literaty or Aesthetic Criticism is unique. The seers have laid down once and for all an important principle for the interpretation of the Creative Genius, in the famous Ṛk :

"Devānām nu vayam jānā
pra vocāma vipanyayā
uktheṣu śasyamāneṣu
yaḥ paśyād uttare yuge"[77]

---

[72] 1.164.20. [73] 10.71.4.
[74] 1.164.39. [75] 10.71.1.
[76] 10.71.2. [77] 10.72.1.

"We shall declare in our poetic composition the geneology (i.e. nature) of the Gods, so that men might (intuitively) apprehend (this experience of ours) as they sing this song in the assemblies at a later time."

The poet has an experience and it is a vital one. He has the poetic urge and he should express it. Though it is his own personal experience he is prepared to express it, since it is universal. In other words, the poet loses his personality, in that of the universe in order to gain a richer and a fuller one. In short, as Keats said, the poet has no personality of his own; or as Abhinavagupta observed, the poet is not different from his critics or audience[78]. The critic is himself an Artist, a Poet. Great poetry can be interpreted only by a Great poet; for as Yāska observed :

"Na hyeṣu pratyakṣam asty anṛṣer atapaso vā."

The poet is a seer; he undertakes penance; he experiences spiritual sacrifice and samādhi. If he intends understanding the poet, the critic too should be a seer, a tapasvin. This implies that the critic should interpret his poet by reviving the original experience of the poet himself. The critic should be able to experience exactly in the same way in which the poet had. Hence does the Ṛgvedic seer declare that when his song is sung at later times, the men of that age and time will apprehend and experience the same thing exactly like him. Therefore, the chief tenet of literary criticism is the identity between the experiences of the poet and his critics or readers. Hence did Bharata observe "Kaver antargatam bhāvam. . . . ", while Tauta Bhaṭṭa emphatically declares :

"nāyakasya kaveḥ śrotuḥ
satrāno'nubhavas tataḥ."

---

[78] "Kavir hi sāmājikatulya eva"—*Abhinavabhāratī*, p. 295.

The experiences of the poet, of the hero and of the audience, are exactly identical. Consequently one Ṛgvedic seer declares.

"Indro brahmendra ṛṣiḥ".

—Indra, the object of the poetic experience, the poet, and the poem are all identical.

When the Ṛgvedic poet declares that the critic of a later age can have the apprehension of his own experience, he means to say that it is the duty of the critic to revive the original experience of the poet. This is possible only when we accept Abhinavagupta's theory of Images. The critic should be "Vimalapratibhānaśālihṛdayaḥ". As he hears the poem, he has some understanding of the meaning of the words. This meaning gives rise to corresponding mental images which he directly and immediately apprehends[79]. The apprehension depends upon the distinctness, liveliness, vividness and intensity of these images. It is "Nirvighnapratītigrāhyam" and it penetrates into the heart directly.

This experience is possible for every one, says the Ṛgvedic seer; and this can be best interpreted only in the words of Abhinavagupta :

"Sarvasāmājikānām eka ghanatayaiva pratipattiḥ sutarām rasaparipoṣāya. sarveṣām anādi-vāsanā-citrīkṛta-cetasām vāsanāsamvādāt."[80]

Consequently the aesthetic experience on the part of the critic iş one of gradual self-revelation, a development of the fuller spirit. The implicit consciousness becomes explicit. Hence the Rasa realisation is suggested by the Vedic poet to be beyond time, space and causality.

"Deśakālapramātṛbhedānniyantrito rasaḥ"[81]

---

[79] *Abhinavabhāratī*, p. 280.

[80] *Ibid.*, p. 281.

[81] *Ibid.*, p. 292.

This theory of Rasa-realisation was developed by Abhinavagupta from passages like 10.72.1 occuring in *Ṛgveda.*

The poet sees the hymn in his vision :
"Yuvābhyām.. prati stomā adṛkṣata"[82]

The poet is a medium of utterence :
"Kavir gīrbhiḥ kāvyenā kaviḥ san"[83]

By his poetic faculties, the poet creates Beauty of the Heaven: "Kaviḥ kavitvā divi rūpam āsajat"[84]. As, the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, which belongs to *Ṛgveda*, declares, the sculpture of the earth is generated out of an imitation of the Divine Sculpture; "Devaśilpa" is no other than "Ātmasanskṛti"; and by the divine Śilpa does our Ātman become Sanskṛta.[85] Hence does the *Viṣṇudharmottara* observe that "Sādṛśya" is essential for any Fine Art[86]. This Sādṛśya is no other than the Aesthetic expression of the Spirit. Once this spirit of Reality is apprehended, then there will arise the Poetic Composition. Fine Art deals with Beauty. Poetry is the quintessence of the Fine Arts. Hence "Kaviḥ kavitvā divirūpamāsajat" means that poetic Beauty is the presentation of the Spirit or Reality as finite, and therefore as suggestive. The value of a poem must, therefore, be judged from the standard of the effective portrayl and suggestion of the spirit.

A living Mind can be, in the words of Plato "a spectator of All Time and of all Existence"; but to "Sākṣī" the Mind should apprehend and experience that or aesthetic consciousness; or as the Immortal seers of the *Ṛgveda* state:

"Kaviḥ kāvyenāsi viśvavit"[87].

---

[82] 8.5.3.
[83] 9.96.17.
[84] 10.124.7.
[85] *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, 6.17.
[86] *Viṣṇudharmottara*, 42.48.
[87] 10.91.3.

SOME VIṢṆU SCULPTURES FROM MĀRWĀR*

By SHRI R. C. AGRAWĀLA

EPIGRAPHIC evidence of Viṣṇu-worship in ancient Rājasthāna can be traced back to early centuries before the birth of Christ[1]. But such does not appear to have been the case in Mārwār (modern Jodhpur Division) at least. Only future discoveries are awaited to throw further light on the antiquity of Viṣṇu-worship (in Pre-Gupta period) in this region.

I. EARLY PERIOD

It was during his archaeological explorations at the ancient site of Bhillamāla[2] that Dr. U. P. Shah of Baroda recovered an image[3] of *sthānaka* Viṣṇu assignable to the transitional period from the Kuṣāṇa art to the art of the Gupta age[4]. The sculptor of Mārwār also deserves great appreciation for the great achievement in carving various scenes[5], from the life of Lord Kṛṣṇa, on two huge stone pillars belonging to the Gupta period. These pillars were

* ABBREVIATIONS USED

E. I.	=	*Epigraphia Indica.*
ASIAR	=	*Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report.*
PRASWC	=	*Progress Report of Archaeological Survey, Western Circle.*
JISOA	=	*Journal of Indian Society of Oriental Art, Calcutta.*

1 *JISAO*, XIII, 1945, p. 55.

2 Modern Bhīnmāla, about 120 miles from Jodhpur.

3 Dr. U. P. Shah informed me long ago that he intended to present the above sculpture to the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay. It is regretted that no exhaustive note on this image has so far been published by Dr. Shah.

4 *Journal of Museums Association of India*, VIII, 1952, Bombay, p. 49, f. n. 1.

5 For details about these scenes consult *ASIAR*, 1905-6, pp-136-7; *ibid*, 1909-10, p. 98; A. Coomarswamy, *History of Indian and Indonesian Art*, 1927, London, p. 26, f. n. 3; *The Classical Age*, 1953, Bombay, pp. 521-2.

excavated at Maṇḍora (ancient Māṇḍavyapura, 5 miles to the North of Jodhpur) and are now preserved in the Sardar Museum at Jodhpur. But no Viṣṇu image, belonging to this period as such, has seen the light of the day in any part of Mārwār so far.

II. Later-Gupta Age

The Sardar Museum at Jodhpur contains an interesting life size statue of Viṣṇu belonging to the later-Gupta period. This image is made of red stone and measures about 6′ 4″ in height[6]. It was discovered during the course of the excavation of a canal at Pālī (40 miles from Jodhpur). In this image, all the hands of *sthānaka* Viṣṇu being broken, the remnants of a lotus and a mace help us in identifying it with that of Viṣṇu. The deity, here, wears the *kirīṭa mukuṭa* and the garland (round the neck) hangs down up to the knees. The belley is very prominent indeed and the girdle bears some similarity with that evident in the famous *govardhanadhāraṇa* sculpture now kept in the Bhārata Kalā Bhavana[7], Banaras Hindu University.

III. Mediaeval Period

It was from Post-Harṣa period onward that we begin to find numerous temples of Viṣṇu and the images worshipped and carved there-in. Epigraphic[8] evidence from this region too seems to corroborate the truth of this statement. The people and the sculptors of Mārwār had a clear-cut idea of various forms and incarnations of Viṣṇu. Maṇḍora,

---

[6] Cf. My article in the *Journal of the Museums Association of India*, IX, 1953, pp. 104-5, Plate XXII, figure 45. This photograph was published for the first time by the author.

[7] *ASIAR*, 1926-7, Plate XLVI (fig. D.) for the photograph of this huge sculpture.

[8] *ASIAR*, 1909-10, pp. 98 ff; *E.I.*, IX, pp. 310, 199, 67-8; *ibid*, IV, pp. 312—3; *ibid*, XVIII, pp. 208 ff; *PRASWC*, 1908, p. 49; *Bombay Gazetteer*, I, Pt. I, p. 477; *Administrative Report of the Archaeological Department, Jodhpur*, VIII, 1935, p. 5, Appendix A.

the ancient capital of Mārwār, continued to remain a centre of Viṣṇu worship down to the 12th century A.D[9]. It was perhaps afterwards that the Śaivites began to gain prominence there. As regards the famous *Vaiṣṇava* temples of Osian[10] (about 39 miles from Jodhpur), Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar[11] brings down their date to 8th century A.D. Śrī G.H. Ojha[12] also refers to a Lakṣmī-Nārāyaṇa image from a 9th century (*Vikrama Saṃvat*) temple at Pālī. Similar references can also be made to several other sculptures from other temples of Mārwār.

(A) Association of Viṣṇu with other gods

It is gratifying to discover numerous images wherein various forms of Viṣṇu have been blended together with Śiva, Brahmā and Sūrya. Such images[13] need to be studied with great care and appreciation of the artistic outlook of the sculptors :—

(i) *Harihara*[14] images :—The ancient temples of Osian depict the *Harihara* images carved in the principal niches outside the main shrines. At one place, on the eastern wall, in the right portion (of Śiva), the deity holds the *triśūla* in the right hand and the bull is seated below. In the other half of the same image, the deity (Viṣṇu) holds a discus and a conch. Below is to be seen *garuḍa*—the *vāhana* of Viṣṇu[15]. Two of the three Harihara temples of Osian were built in the *pañcāyatana*[16] style. It is regretted that no image

---

9 *ASIAR*, 1909-10, p. 102.

10 For details about these temple consult *ASIAR*, 1908-9, pp. 101 ff.

11 *Ibid*, pp. 111-2.

12 *Jodhpur Rājya kā Itihāsa*, Ajmer, 1938, Hindī, I, pt. I, p. 57; Cf. *PRASWC*, 1908, p. 44.

13 Of prominent gods of Hindu pantheon.

14 Blending of Viṣṇu and Śiva in one form.

15 *ASIAR*, 1908-9, pp. 102-3.

16 Cf. Percy Brown, *Indian Architecture*, second edition, Vol. I, p. 139.

has been recovered from the main shrines of these religious edifices. The ancient temple at Buchkalā[17] too has an image of *Harihara* carved in its principal niche[18]. Similar images have been discovered at Āmvām[19] Ghusai (Gwalior State)[20] etc. One such sculpture also adds to the beauty of the Rājputānā Museum at Ajmer.

(ii) *Blending of Brahmā-Viṣṇu-Maheśa and Sūrya*:—The *trimūrti* (triad) consisting of Brahmā-Viṣṇu and Śiva is too well known to require any mention. Sometimes Sūrya is also added to the above triad. Such images are found in later period only. According to Dr. Bhandarkar "they have not yet been traced in temples prior to the 11th century. We find them actually sculptured in the shrines round about Saciyāmātā's temple and many other temples at such places as Dilmāl in north Gujrat, Bhavāl[21] in the Jodhpur state and so forth[22]."

(a) Referring to the image of Saciyāmātā's temple, Bhandarkar states that "it has three heads, the central wearing a coronet and side ones the matted hair. It wears boots. It originally had eight hands which are now all broken off but the objects held in the upper hands can be seen. They are a lotus and trident on the proper right and a lotus and a discus on the left"[23].

(b) On the main shrine-door of the famous Someśwara temple at Kirāḍu (about 147 miles from Jodhpur), the

---

[17] Parganā Bilārā, Jodhpur Division.

[18] *PRASWC*, 1907 p. 38.

[19] *Ibid*, 1905, p. 46.

[20] *Annual Report of the Archaeological Department Gwalior State*, for year 1934-5, plate XII b.

[21] I personally examined this sculpture and now I agree with G. H. Ojha when he finds altogether absence of Viṣṇu here (Cf. Ojha *op. cit.*, p. 36). Dr. Bhandarkar's description (*PRASWC*, 1911, pp. 36-7) does not seem to tally with the actual details of the image carved in the principal niche of Mātāji temple at Bhavāla (about 87 miles from Jodhpur).

[22] *ASIAR*, 1908-9, p. 114.

[23] *Ibid*, p. 112.

frieze depicts a curious figure in which Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Śiva and Sūrya appear to have been blended together. "It has one face and originally had 10 hands in all, some of which have now been broken off. The objects, held in the hands that have remained, are the two lotuses of Sūrya, the discus and the mace of Viṣṇu, the libation ladle of Brahmā and the bow and arrow probably of Śiva. The figure has been flanked by Naṭeśa on both the sides"[24].

The following sculptures (depicting the blending of various gods) from various parts of India need to be compared with those from Mārwār described above :—

(i) Brahmā - Viṣṇu - Maheśa - Sūrya :—from Kāmān,[25] Jhālarāpāṭana[26] different places of Gujrāt[27] etc.

(ii) Sūrya-Brahmā and Śiva :—from Khajurāho[28] and Bhavāl[29].

(iii) Viṣṇu and Sūrya :—from Jhālāvāḍa museum[30]. The ruined Sun-temple at Rāṇakapura (modern Rānpur, Jodhpur Division) presents very peculiar images wherein the upper portion is that of Viṣṇu, Brahmā and Śiva while the lower portion consists of Sūrya wearing long boots[31].

(iv) Brahmā-Viṣṇu and Sūrya :—from Rāmgarh[32].

(B) THREE-FACED VIṢṆU

In a niche of the temple at Sādaḍī (Jodhpur Division), a figure depicting 6 armed Viṣṇu has got three faces i.e.

---

24 *PRASWC*, 1907, p. 41. Cf. also my article "Sūrya Worship in Ancient Mārwār", *Maru Bhārati*, Pilānī, II, no. 1, pp. 24-5 for these cojoined forms.

25 Now kept in the Ajmer Museum. See *PRASWC*, 1919, p. 65; Cf. J. N. Banerjee, *Development of Hindu Iconography*, Calcutta, p. 6.

26 *PRASWC*, 1905, p. 32.

27 H. D. Sankalia, *Archaeology of Gujrat*, 1941, Bombay, pp. 163-4, p. 164, f. n. 1.

28 S. Kramrisch, *Hindu Temple*, II, Calcutta, pp. 373-4, plate VI.

29 *Op. cit.*

30 Unpublished so far.

31 Ojha, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

32 *PRASWC*, 1905, p 50.

those of man, boar and lion. The spires of the temples are influenced by the Solaṅkī art of Gujrāt[33]. A somewhat similar sculpture in the principal back niche of the last Viṣṇu temple at Kirāḍu has also been noticed by Dr. Bhandarkar[34]. On the other hand, a six handed image, in the Mahākāla temple at Bijauliā (Mewāḍa, 32 miles from Koṭā), depicts 3 different faces[35] i.e. those of lion, horse and boar. Here it refers to *Nṛsiṃha*, *Boar* and *Kalki* incarnations of Viṣṇu while the Sādaḍī image (quoted above) presents the association of Viṣṇu with his *Boar* and *Nṛsiṃha* incarnations. These sculptures need comparison with those found at Mathura[36], Kurukṣetra[37] etc.

(C) Viṣṇu having 10 hands

In the principal niche (facing South) of the famous Viṣṇu temple at Kirāḍu, *daśabhuja* Viṣṇu is seated in the *siddhāsana mudrā* and nimbus can be seen behind his head. Unfortunately the *āyudhas* cannot be seen for all the hands are broken[38]. Mediaeval sculptures depicting ten handed Viṣṇu have also been discovered in Gujrāt[39]. Dr. M. R. Majumdar also states here that some of the sculptures from Gujrāt have been kept in the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay.

---

[33] *PRASWC*, 1908. p. 56.

[34] *Ibid*, 1907, pp. 40 ff. Cf. Ojha, *op. cit.*, p. 46. For a similar 13th century A. D. sculpture from Gujrāt and now kept in the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay, consult *Annual Report of the Prince of Wales Museum*, for year 1944-5, Bombay, 1945, plate facing p. 4. Cf. C. Sītārāmamūrti for the interpretation of such forms of Viṣṇu *Proceedings of the All India Oriental Conference held at Nāgpur*, 1946, p. 39 of Archaeology Section.

[35] *PRASWC*, 1905, p. 53.

[36] V. S. Agrawāla's article in *A History of Indian People*, VI, 1946, Lahore, p. 449.

[37] *ASIAR*, 1922-3, p. 89.

[38] *PRASWC*, 1907, pp. 40 ff

[39] M.R. Majumdar, *Indian Historical Quarterly*, XVI, 1940, pp. 313-4, plates III-IV.

(D) STANDING VIṢṆU

(a) The Sardar Museum at Jodhpur contains the detached portion of a principal niche (of some temple of Kirāḍu) wherein the *caturbhuja* Viṣṇu wears a *mukuṭa* on the head and holds the conch in the upper left hand, the upper right being broken. The lower two hands rest on the heads of two dwarf attendants, each standing to right and left below. The carving of the images[40] presents a very beautiful art of 12th century A.D. The height of the image is about 2 feet 2 inches.

(b) The image of *caturbhuja* Viṣṇu in the Hanumat temple at Nāḍol (photo no. 3038 Western Circle) needs comparision with the famous sculpture from Sultānpur and now preserved in the provincial Museum at Lucknow[41].

(c) The blackstone image of Viṣṇu at Sādaḍī holds the conch, the mace, the discus and the lotus in all the four hands and seems to refer to the *Trivikrama* form of the deity[42].

(d) Viṣṇu image at Buchkalā[43] also refers to *Trivikrama* form of Viṣṇu.

(e) In the principal niche of the Harihara temple at Osian, the standing deity touches the head of a demon with his raised left foot and near the lower right hand is a horse's head[44]. This image thus refers to *Trivikrama* form of Viṣṇu. Dr. Bhandarkar also remarks that the "*Vāmana avatāra* has in no temple of Osian been figured as a single

[40] An unpublished image. For the depiction of the *āyudhas* only in upper hands consult H. K. Śāstrī, *South Indian Images of Gods and Goddess*, Madras, 1916, p. 52 f. n. 1.

[41] Cf. A. Coomarswamy, *op. cit.*, fig. 222.

[42] *PRASWC*, 1908, p. 56; Ojha, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

[43] Ojha, p. 31.

[44] *ASIAR*, pp. 102-3. Cf. Kramrisch, *op. cit.*, II, plate LXX. For *Trivikrama* from Rāmgarh, see *PRASWC*, 1905, p. 50. There is one in the Ajmer Museum too; Cf. *Annual Report of the Rājputānā Museum*, Ajmer, 1923, p. 2; *ibid*, 1922-3, p. 5.

dwarf with an umbrella as we see it elsewhere, but is always represented by his further development of *Trivikrama*"[45]. T. G. Rao[46] also refers to one *Trivikrama* image from Chāṭsu (Jaipur State).

(f) A thirteenth century inscribed image of white marble in the temple of Raṇachoḍarāyajī at Kheḍa (ancient Kṣīrapur)[47].

(g) In the Jagadīśa temple at Āsopa, an image of *caturbhuja* Viṣṇu bears an inscription of two lines on its pedestal.

(h) Marble images in the Mahālakṣmī temple at Merta city, belong to a much later period.

(i) Several images lying in the Varāha temple at Bhīnmāl.

(E) Āsana-mūrtis

(i) Reference to *daśabhuja* Viṣṇu sitting in the *siddhāsana mudrā* has already been made above.

(ii) Viṣṇu and his consort are seen seated[48] together on *garuḍa*[49]. Such images have been found at various places in Mārwār as :—

1. Kirāḍu (now kept in the Sardar Museum, Jodhpur).
2. Taila (now kept in the Sardar Museum, Jodhpur); a black stone image.
3. Osian[50].
4. Pālī[51].

---

[45] *ASIAR*, 1908-9, p. 113.

[46] *Elements of Hindu Iconography*, Madras, Vol. I, pt. I, plate LII, figure 1, facing p. 175.

[47] For details consult the *Rājasthāna Bhārati*, Bikaner, July 1953, pp. 27—34.

[48] In a niche of the temple (near the Saciyāmātā's temple at Osian), Viṣṇu is depicted standing by the side of Lakṣmī.

[49] *Garuḍa* is the *vāhana* (vehicle) of Viṣṇu. At Osian the *garuḍa* is even shown as holding the tail of a serpent; while at Sādaḍī it faces an elegantly carved *varāha* (*PRASWC*, 1908, p. 56).

[50] *ASIAR*, 1908-9, p. 103.

[51] Ojha, *Op. cit.*, p. 57.

(iii) Viṣṇu alone seated on *garuḍa*[52] at the following places :—

1. Door lintels of the main shrines at Osian.
2. Sādaḍī[53] in the temple of Varāha.

It is interesting to note that not a single image of Viṣṇu (from Mārwār) has so far been recovered wherein Viṣṇu is seated on *garuḍa* and has got more than 4 hands. Of course literary evidence refers to such images having 8, 10, 12, 14, 16 and even 20 hands[54].

(F) Yogāsana mūrtis

(a) Images depicting Viṣṇu in *Yogāsana mudrā* or *Buddhāvatāra* of Viṣṇu have been discovered throughout the nook and corner of India[55]. The temples of Mārwār too bear testimony to the existence of somewhat similar sculptures carved at Osian[56], Bhuṇḍānā[57], Chohṭana[58], Bhāṭūnda[59], Mālkoṭ fort at Merta city[60] etc. It is really interesting to note the religious notions of Mārwār sculptor at Osian. The artist carved the *Buddhāvatāra* of Viṣṇu and not the *Rāmāvatāra*. It is not yet possible to account for the fancy expressed for *Buddhāvatāra*.

---

[52] "Viṣṇu seated on *garuḍa*" is a common device in ancient Indian art. At one place in the Sāsabahu temple at Nāgadā, *garuḍa* is depicted even lifting Viṣṇu who is already seated in the *baddha-padmāsana mudrā*. A similar sculpture has also been recovered in Bengal [cf. *JISOA*, 1945, p. 95].

[53] Photo, Western Circle No. 2972.

[54] *Indian Historical Quarterly*, XVI, p. 526.

[55] Cf. D. R. Sahni, *Archaeological Remains at Sāmbhar* (Jaipur State), pp. 15-16; *PRASWC*, 1911, p. 38; *ivid*, 1907, p. 30; *ibid*, 1905, p. 30; *Indian Historical Quarterly*, 1941, p. 384; *JISOA*, XIII, pp. 89 ff; T. G. Rao, *op. cit.*, I, pt. I, pp. 85-6; *Ancient India*, VI, New Delhi, p. 41 plate XII A, B; *Annual Report of the Deptt. of Archaeology, Gwalior State, for year* 1923-4, plate 3 A; *Working Report of the Rājputānā Museum, Ajmer*, for year 1926, published 1927, p. 7; V. S. Agrawala, *Handbook of the Sculptures in the Curzon Museum of Archaeology* at Mathurā, Allahabad, fig. 45.

[56] *ASIAR*, 1908-9. pp. 100 ff.

[57] *PRASWC*, 1911, p. 38,

[58] Ojha, p. 47.

[59] *Ibid*, p. 61.

[60] The peculiarity of this image was first noticed by the present author and a short note in Hindi was published in the local weekly paper, the *Prajāsevaka*, Jodhpur, Dec. 9, 1953, p. 5.

(b) *A rare Viṣṇu image*

It was some years back that a black stone image (about 18"×13") from Dīḍwānā (ancient Deḍwāṇaka, 123 miles from Jodhpur) was acquired for the Sardar Museum, Jodhpur. The sculpture, belonging to the early mediaeval period, is in a state of perfect preservation and does not show any signs of damage or decay[61].

In this image *caturbhuja* Viṣṇu is seated in the *Yogāsana mudrā* with the palms of his lower two hands placed one over the other between the soles of the feet in a traditional manner. These palms (*añjalis*) are placed in a manner as to hide the naval portion of the deity altogether. Since the legs have been kept cross-legged the soles of both the feet are clearly visible. Under-neath the legs is to be seen the *mālā* resting on the upturned lotus-throne. Just below this throne can be seen two persons, facing each other but looking at the deity seated above. To their right and touching the *Kamalāsana* on both the sides are carved the *siṃhavyālas* with their jaws wide open and facing the same direction.

Besides this, Viṣṇu wears the usual "tiara" on the head, sacred thread on the body and ornaments round the neck, ankles, arms, ears, etc. There is also a *śrīvatsa* mark on the chest of the seated deity who, with his eyes half closed, sits in a calm and meditating pose. Behind the head of the deity appears the halo encircled by 13 hoods of a serpent from outside. Above these hoods can be seen two flying *gandharvas* who appear to be coming in order to garland the meditating deity. On both the sides of Visṇu (i.e. between the flying *gandharvas* and the *siṃhavyālas*), the presence of the *makaravyālas*, the *aśvavyālas* and the *gajavyālas* one

---

[61] For the photograph, consult my article in the *Journal of the Museums Association of India*, Bombay, 1953, IX, p. 105, plate XXII, fig. 46 facing p. 104. Future discoveries may bring to light some more images of this type.

respectively over the other (in a descending order) is a constant source of beauty for this image.

As to the details about the *mālā* held in the upper hands, the upper portion of the garland remains somewhat hidden behind the neck of the deity. Further it touches the upper portion of the arms but below the *bhujabandas* worn by the seated deity. Then it hangs still below and appears again on the *kamalāsanā* which has already been referred to above.

It is interesting to discover that nowhere (except the above image of the Sardar Museum, Jodhpur) does Viṣṇu hold the garland[62] in the upper two hands. Now only that there is utter absence of the *āyudhas* of Viṣṇu here. It is still to be traced whether any Indian literary text allows the carving of *Yogāsana* Viṣṇu in the form represented by the Dīḍawānā sculpture, most of the similar to those of the D. 37 sculpture of Mathura museum.

(G) ŚEṢAŚĀYĪ IMAGES

Sculptures depicting Viṣṇu sleeping on Śeṣa (the chief of the serpents) are also not wanting in Mārwār. They have been discovered at various places such as pīthānwalā[63], Pīpāḍa[64], Kheḍa[65], Sādaḍī[66], Osian[67], Bhinmal (temple of Caṇḍīnātha), Mahālakṣmī temple at Merta city. etc. These sculptures need comparison with another *Śeṣaśāyī* image from Rājputānā[68].

---

[62] The objects usually held in the upper two hands include any two of the *āyudhas* of Viṣṇu. These *āyudhas* were the conch, the mace, the lotus and the discus.

[63] Now kept in the Sardar Museum at Jodhpur.

[64] *PRASWC*, 1907, p. 39; Ojha, p. 31.

[65] Cf. *Rājasthāna Bhāratī*, Bikaner, July 1953, pp. 30-1; Ojha, p. 49; *PRASWC*, 1912, p. 56. It is a very huge sculpture.

[66] Photo no. 2967, Western Circle.

[67] *ASIAR*, 1908-9, pp. 102, 109 etc. It is regretted that some body took away the famous image from the ruined temple situated near the Railway Station at Osian. I visited the site in July, 1953 and found the sculpture missing.

[68] T. G. Rao, *op. cit.*, I, pt. I, pp. 114-5, plate XXXIV; C. f, *JISOA*, XIII, 1945, p. 97 and f. n. 2.

(H) INCARNATIONS OF VIṢṆU DEPICTED TOGETHER

1. The sculptors of Mārwār had a very good knowledge of various *avatāras* of Viṣṇu. This is well attested by the discovery of seperate sculptures of the *avatāras* and the depiction of all the incarnations together on the slabs and the fragmentary pieces of door-jambs. The latter variety includes the following-well known sculptures :—

(i) Door-jambs from Maṇḍor (now kept in the Sardar Museum, Jodhpur), belonging to the 9th century A.D. Of these one refers to *Man-lion* and *Vāmana* incarnations depicted one over the other; while the other depicts *Matsya*, *Kūrma*, *Nṛsiṃha* and *Vāmana avatāras* in a similar manner.

(ii) On the door-sides of the subsidiary shrine enshrining the image of Śeṣaśāyī at Kheḍa.

(iii) On the door-sides of the main shrine of the Mātājī-temple at Sudrāsana, parganā Dīḍawānā.

(iv) A black stone door frame (about 3 feet high, kept in the Jodhpur Museum) from Kirāḍu depicts *Vārāha*, *Vāmana* and *Rāmacandra* incarnations[69]. Here Rāma is holding the bow and arrow in his two hands. The carving of *dvibāhu* Rāma here is very interesting indeed. Similar jambs have also been found at Sīrpur in C.P.[70]. It seems quite curious to find that there is not a single temple extent at Osian where the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu are sculptured on the door-sides"[71].

---

[69] It is not yet possible to account for the utter absence of Rāma's representation in the temples at Osian and Maṇḍora. No such sculpture has also been recovered from these places.

[70] *PRASWC*, 1908, p. 47.

[71] Bhandarkar, *ASIAR*, 1908-9, p. 113.

II. About half a mile outside the village Sevāḍī (Jodhpur Division) numerous sculptures are lying scattered at one place. Of these, one rectangular stone slab depicts ten incarnations of Viṣṇu[72].

It is regretted that Mārwār region has not yet yielded any sculpture wherein Viṣṇu is seen standing in the middle and the ten incarnations being depicted on both the sides of the deity[73]. One such sculpture from Sāmbhar (Jaipur, Rājasthāna) has well been described by D. R. Sahni[74].

III. *Carving of incarnations on the ceiling* of the Jageśwara temple (now called Bārādarī) at Sādaḍī is very interesting in the field of ancient Indian iconography. The ceiling under reference was lying unnoticed so far and I had the proud privilege of publishing a short note in Hindī[75] for the first time. It may be described in a summarised form here i.e. in the middle of the ceiling *caturbhuja* Viṣṇu is seated on the *garuḍa* and round about Viṣṇu is carved a circle. The deity holds the mace and the discus in the upper two hands. Outside the circle (referred to above) on both the sides of Viṣṇu are carved different incarnations, i.e. *Matsya*, *Kacchapa*, *Vārāha*, *Nṛsiṃha*. . . plough-bearer *Balarāma*, two handed *Buddha* in a meditating pose, *Kalki* mounted on horse etc. Nearby is also depicted the *śeṣa-śāyī* form of Viṣṇu.

Besides that, on both the sides of Viṣṇu, are carved various scenes from the life of Kṛṣṇa. These include :—

(a) Four cows and their calves sucking their mother's milk.

(b) A lady churning the milk.

---

[72] *PRASWC* 1908, p. 54; photo no. 2967, Western circle. The State Museum at Bharatpur too has got one sculpture of this variety.

[73] Cf. *PRASWC*, 1905, pp. 32, 45.

[74] *Archaeological Remains and Excavations at Sāmbhar*, Jaipur, pp. 15-6.

[75] Cf. My note published in the Hindī paper the *Janasattā*, Dec. 27, 1953, p. 8.

(c) A lady, with a baby in her lap, perhaps refers to Mother Yaśodā holding Kṛṣṇa in her arms.

(d) Fight of Kṛṣṇa with a demon, an elephant etc.

(e) Kṛiṣṇa's combat with some wrestler.

It appears from the above account that Sādaḍī was perhaps a very important centre of *Vaiṣṇava* trends in the past. The sculptor at Sādaḍī came out quite successful in paying homage to Viṣṇu by carving several religious scenes on the ceiling referred to above.

(I) Individual Incarnations of Viṣṇu

I. Matsya

No seperate sculpture of *Matsyāvatāra* has come to light so far. Reference to this incarnation carved on the door-jambs has already been made above.

II. Kūrma

In the Mahālakṣmī temple at Merta city, is lying an image of *sthānaka caturbhuja* Viṣṇu.[76] It is worth noting here that there is depicted a tortoise (*kūrma*) on one side. It will not be too much to conclude from this that this sculpture refers to the *kūrma* incarnation of Viṣṇu.

III. Varāha

The temples of Osian, Pārśvanātha Phalodi (near Merta Road), Chohṭana[77], Sādaḍī[78] Pīpāḍa[79], Bhīnmāla depict very interesting sculptures of *Vārāha* incarnation. Speaking of the image of Phalodi *Vārāha*, T. G. Rao[80] writes that it is a "remarkable piece of art. The happy proportion of parts of body of *Vārāha*, the sculpturing of the Nāgas under-

---

[76] The *āyudhas* of Viṣṇu are quite clear here. The sculpture has remained unstudied so far. Only a short note in Hindī has been published by the author.

[77] *PRASWC*, 1907, p. 43; Ojha, p. 47.

[78] Photo Nos. 2970 and 2972, Western Circle.

[79] *PRASWC*, 1907, p. 38.

[80] *Op. cit.*, I, pt. I, plate XXXIX, figure 2 pp. 141-2. Also consult *JISOA*, 1945, p. 122; *Indian Historical Quarterly* XVII, p. 327.

neath an expanded lotus leaf so as to be suggestive of the *pātāla loka* which is the abode of these beings, all these and many other features in workmanship stamp the artist as a real master of his craft. That to this vigorous and highly powerful *Vārāha*, the supporting of a *devī* is like child's play, becomes patent by the ease which she is shown to be held on his bent left hand. The lotus leaf on the head of *Vārāha*, which with its concave side turned down, serves as an umbrella and indicates the god to be just rising from the Ocean".

The life size statue of *Vārāha*[81] in the famous *Vārāha-jī*-temple at Bhīnmāla is in no way inferior to the sculpture described above. *Vārāha's* image has also been carved in the niche of the famous Viṣṇu temple at Kheḍa[82].

IV. Vāmana

At Osian, the *Vāmana avatāra* has in no temple been figured as a single dwarf with an umbrella[83] as we see it elsewhere but is always represented by his further development of *Trivikrama*[84].

A sculpture (of red stone) from Maṇḍora and now kept in the Sardar Museum at Jodhpur, is dated in 9th or 10th century A. D. "In the upper lower corner stands Viṣṇu in the form of a corpulent dwarf, with an umbrella over his hand as a token of his gift of three paces of land. The dwarf is seen in the *virāṭ* form, his left leg raised on high, as he spans the three regions with his right leg, in vain endeavour to restrain him"[85].

The *Vāmana* incarnation can also be seen in the 11th century A. D. temple at Chohṭana[86].

---

[81] An unpublished and unstudied stone-image so far.

[82] *PRASWC*, 1912, p. 56.

[83] The Maṇḍora door-jambs, referred to above, depict *Vāmana* with an umbrella over his head. [84] *ASIAR*, 1908-9, p. 113.

[85] *ASIAR*, 1909-10, p. 97.

[86] *PRASWC*, 1907, p. 43; Ojha, p. 47.

V. Nṛsimha

The temples of Osian[87], Phaloḍi[88], Kheḍa[89] present beautiful illustrations of *Nṛsiṃha* images of Mārwār.

VI. Saṅkarṣaṇa- Vāsudeva

A passing reference to huge pillars (from Maṇḍora) depicting various scenes from the life of Kṛṣṇa has already been made above. During my archaeological tour in the Jodhpur circle, I was happy to find out similar scenes also carved in the ancient temples of Osian, Kekīnda, Kirāḍu, Sādaḍī etc. Kṛṣṇa-worship[90] was of course very popular in the whole of ancient Mārwār.

The representation of *Balarāma* in sculptures can well be seen at various places, such as Osian[91], Sewāḍī, Sādaḍī, Kheḍa[92], Mahālakṣmī temple at Merta city, Kekīnda etc.

In one of the subsidiary shrines of Harihara temple at Osian, a small niche depicts *caturbhuja* Balarāma holding a ploughshare and a club in his two back hands. The third hand holds the wine cup while the forth one is busy in clasping Revatī, consort of Baladeva. This is a comparatively unusual combination[93]. There is also the canopy of a five hooded snake over the head of Balarāma. This iconographic representation is quite in keeping with the mythological belief that regards Balarāma as an incarnation of Śeṣa.

Elsewhere, outside the main shrine of the Sun temple at Osian, Balarāma is also to be seen standing alone in a small niche. He can well be recognised by the plough (hala) held in one of his hands.

---

87 *ASIAR*, 1908-9, pp. 104, 109, 113.

88 *PRASWC*, 1910, p. 60.

89 *Ibid*, 1912 p. 56.

90 Cf. my article "Rāmāyaṇa scenes in Rājasthāna sculptures", *Indian Historical Quarterly*, June 1954, pp. (?)

91 Cf. *ASIAR*, 1908-9, pp. 101 ff.

92 *PRASWC*, 1912, p. 56.

93 Cf. *JISOA*, XIV, 1946, p. 26.

The two projecting pilasters (of the above Sun-temple at Osian) on both the sides are elegantly carved with the figures of dancing females. Above them are Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa and Saṅkarṣaṇa-Balarāma, each having four hands and sitting on the *garuḍa*. The former (i.e. Kṛṣṇa) has the usual attributes of Viṣṇu i.e. conch, lotus, mace and discus. The latter holds the *hala* and the *musala* in his two back hands; one of his front hands is holding the conch while the fourth hand is in the *Jñāna mudrā*. There is a canopy of snake-hoods as usual and the image can well be identified with that of Balarāma. The other sculpture (described just above), in conjunction with Balarāma, must be identified with Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva[94].

These sculptures are very important for "Balarāma on *garuḍa* with conch in his hand is an extremely rare mode of showing *Vyūha Saṅkarṣaṇa*, the other being that where he is depicted like Vāsudeva in all respects, but holding *gadā*, *śaṅkha*, *padma* and *cakra*. Mention may be made to the four armed image of Baladeva discovered at Baghra (Dacca, Bengal) which can be dated in the late mediaeval period. This well carved relief is very similaı to that of an unusual four armed *sthānaka Viṣṇu*; it holds a mace, a wheel and a conch-shell in its back right, back left and front left hands respectively and stands on a double petalled lotus below which sits *Garuḍa* with his hands in the *añjali* pose and it is accompanied by Śrī and Puṣṭi; in the place of the usual snake canopy, an umbrella is shown spread over its head. The only distinctive feature which gives its identify is a ploughshare held by its front right hand. One is justified in comparing this with the second Osian Baladeva just noticed; the *jñāna mudrā*, in one of the hands of the latter, can be explained by the *Pañcarātra* ideology that Saṅkarṣaṇa-Balarāma typified knowledge and it was he who expounded the *Sātvatavidhi*" [95].

---

[94] Cf. *ASIAR*, pp. 106, 113.

[95] J. N. Bannerjee, *JISOA*, XIV, 1946, pp. 26-7.

Figures of Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma can also be seen carved near the *Saciyā Mātā's* temple at Osian. Besides that, numerous scenes from the life of Vāsudeva are also depicted on the outside portion of the temples at Osian. Most prominent of these scenes is that representing the *govardhanadhāraṇa līlā* of Śrī Kṛṣṇa. It is interesting to note here at one place that even the *Vrajavāsins* are helping their leader Kṛṣṇa in lifting the Govardhana mountain. The sculptor of Osian thus showed great originality in carving the above scene quite successfully. The image of *Haladhara* Balarāma has also been carved outside the Viṣṇu temple at Kheḍa[96]. Reference to Viṣṇu incarnations and Kṛṣṇa-*līlā* scenes carved on the ceiling of the Sādaḍī temple has already been made above.

A stray sculpture from Maṇḍora[97] presents very interesting details, for in that image, the *caturbhuja sthānaka* deity holds the *gadā* and the *cakra* in the upper two hands and his consort is standing by his side. Besides that, the lower left hand of the deity appears behind the back of the lady while the right hand of the latter rests on the right shoulder of the standing deity. The *vanamālā* of the deity hangs up to the middle portion of his legs. The sacred thread and various ornaments worn on the body of the deity add to the grace of this sculpture. The deity wears a *mukuṭa* on his head while the face is broken. A somewhat similar sculpture from some other place has been ascribed by T. G. Rao[98] to that of Kṛṣṇa-Rukmiṇī in the *sthānaka mudrā*. The former sculpture presents no *āyudha puruṣas* or the *garuḍa* usually carved below. It may also be possible that it refers to Lakṣmī-Nārāyaṇa standing together.

---

[96] *PRASWC*, 1912, p. 56.

[97] *ASIAR*, 1908-9, pp. 109-10. Only the photograph exists in the records of the Western Circle. No body knows where the image has been kept at present. I have seen only a copy of the above photograph in the album of the Sardar Museum, Jodhpur.

[98] *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, pt. I, plate LVIII, facing p. 205.

It is regretted that no independent image of *dvibāhu* Balarāma has so far been recovered from Mārwār[99].

During my archaeological tour in the Jodhpur division[100], I happened to discover a very peculiar way of carving Vinṣu figures on the square memorial pillars installed near some temple or a tank. On all the four sides of these square pillars are carved principal deities of the Hindu pantheon and Viṣṇu is represented here by *Govardhanadhara* Kṛṣṇa. It becomes now evident that worship of Viṣṇu in the form of Kṛṣṇa had gained a great popularity in this part of Rājasthāna at least. On the other hand, Rāmāyaṇa scenes were far less attractive to the common folk. The Rājasthānī paintings too tell the same story.

VII. Rama

Reference to *Rāmāvatāra* depicted on a door frame from Kirāḍu has already been made above. Here Rāma is standing with a bow in one hand and the arrow in the other. The Nīlakaṇṭha—Mahādeva temple at Kekīnd, besides depicting Rāmāyaṇa scenes, also present *dvi-bāhu* Rāma in a similar pose. Recently I found an independent image of Rāma carved in a niche outside the main shrine of Raṇachoḍarāya-ji-temple at Kheḍa[101]. It is peculiar to find the utter absence of Rāmāvatāra in the ancient temples at Osian. It is not possible to account for this state of affairs. On the other hand, sculptures of Mārwār present this incarnation of Viṣṇu along with other incarnations at one place. On the whole, the Rāma incarnation gained less popularity as compared to the *Kṛṣṇāvatāra.*

---

99 For such an image from Sāmbhar, consult D. R. Sahni, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

100 Such stone pillars have been discovered at Arnā (12 miles from Jodhpur), Kekīnd, Merta Road, Ludravā (10 miles from Jaisalmer) etc.

101 For details consult my paper "Rāmāyaṇa scenes in Rājasthāna Sculptures", *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Calcutta, June 1954.

VIII. Kalki

Like the Rāmāvatāra, the depiction of *Kalki* incarnation can also be found in sculptures depicting all the incarnations together. In the Epics and the *Purāṇas*, *Kalki* is described as the tenth incarnation of Viṣṇu. According to the *Agni-Purāṇa*, *Kalki* rides on the horse-back and holds a bow, a quiver, conch-shell, sword and a disc in his hands[102]. In Mārwār sculptures, figures of *Kalki* are to be seen carved at the following places:—Kheḍa, Sādaḍī, Sevāḍī, Chohṭana[103] etc. No separate images of *Kalki* from Mārwār have been recovered so far[104]. Even Dr. Bhandarkar had to cancel his identification of *Kalki* of the Harṣanātha temple at Sīkara (Rājasthāna). This sculpture was later on identified with that of Revanta[105].

IX. Hayagrīva (?)

He was the chief of the demons who snatched away the Vedas from the mouth of Brahmā necessitating the "fish-incarnation" of Viṣṇu to recover them. The sculptures of Mārwār fail to throw any light on the sculptures of Hayagrīva from this region. Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar happened to ascribe its presentation on the door lintels of a shrine at Osian[106] but the identification seems to be doubtful. A sculpture here depicts Sūrya in the *sthānaka mudrā* and below are to be seen two horse-faced[107] persons who may be identified with the sons of Sūrya[108].

This is in nutshell a short account of some Viṣṇu sculptures from Mārwār.

---

[102] Cf. *Indian Historical Quarterly*, XVII, p. 385.

[103] Ojha, p. 47.

[104] Cf. a similar statement of Dr. J. N. Banerjee about *Kalki* in Indian sculpture in *JISOA*, 1946, p. 34.

[105] Cf. *PRASWC*, 1910 p. 54; *Journal of Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Calcutta, 1909, p. 391.

[106] *ASIAR*, 1908-9, p. 114.

[107] That is, *Vaḍavā-vaktra*.

[108] Cf. somewhat similar scupture in the Rājputānā Museum, Ajmer T. G. Rao, I, pt. II, Plate XC, pp. 314 ff

NĪLĀMBARĀCĀRYA

By Manoranjana Shastri

Nīlāmbarācārya is an eminent digest-writer on *Dharmaśāstra* in ancient Kāmarūpa. Unfortunately none of his works has yet been published. His "*Kālakaumudī*" a big Nibandha (digest) dealing with appropriate time for various religious rites, has been included (as *Kāmarūpa-smṛti* or Assam-smṛti) in the curriculum of the Bengal Sanskrit Śikṣā Pariṣad. Only two of his works have been found in manuscript viz. the *Śrāddhaprakāśa* or *Śrāddha-bhāṣya* and the *Kālakaumudī*.

In the following pages we propose to give a brief account of this author and his works, of which even the reminicence is gradually sinking into oblivion along with the classical Sanskrit scholars of the State.

Nīlāmbarācārya gives us to know very little about himself. In the concluding verses of the *Śrāddha-prakāśa* he informs us that, his father was *Saṅkarṣaṇa* by name. He (*Saṅkarṣaṇa*) was pious, very prominent by the fame and good acts, the foremost of all the Brāhmaṇas in the world and the fittest for all religious performances.

He deserted his mortal frame at will in the sacred place where the Gaṅgā falls into the ocean and freed himself from the cycle of birth and death. Those wise men who had the opportunity to witness him doing this miracle, were led to firmly believe that the supernatural acts that are said to have been done by the ancient sages must be accepted as true. He had a son named *Nīlāmbara* who being well versed in all the śāstras became specially efficient in the mystery of the *Nyāya-Śāstra*. This eminent scholar has done this work. May it remove the darkness of ignorance from the *pitṛ-karma* like a lamp. The author no doubt, has shown his proficiency

in different *Śāstras* throughout his work. In the colophon of the '*Kāla-kaumudī*' he has informed us more, he had studied the *Śāstras* from his father and acquired profound knowledge of them. Besides the local tradition there are some internal evidences in his works which prove that he belonged to *Kāmarūpa* or Assam.

In the *Śrāddha-prakāśa* explaining the meaning of the word *Mahāsalka* our author has said that *Mahāsalka* is a kind of fish popularly called *Brihannicchala*.

"महासल्क इति, बृहन्निच्छल इति यस्य रूढ़िः।"[1]

In another place of the work he used the word *Gandhacanā* to denote 'भूस्तृण' as :—

भूस्तृणं गन्धचनाख्यः शाकविशेषः"।[2]

As far as we know, there is no usage of any of these two words in any other vernacular of India. But in *Kāmarūpa* or lower Assam these two words are generally used—*Nicchala* to denote a kind of selfish and *Gandhacanā* to denote a kind of scented plant like arum.

Explaining the *Kātyāyana-Sūtra* "युग्मानासयेत्" the author observed that if 'तालव्यशकार' is read instead 'दन्त्यसकार' then आशयेत् means भोजयेत् (should feed). In other parts of our vast country the difference in pronounciation between 'श' and 'स' can be easily noticed while in Assam that difference is not maintained distinctly except in writing. The author knew it and that is why he used the objective तालव्य to distinguish 'शकार' from 'सकार' as "तालव्यशकारपक्षे तु युग्मान् भोजयेदित्यर्थः।"[3]

Nīlāmbarācārya discusses the question whether the sense of the word मास (month) conveys Solar (सौर) or Lunar (चान्द्र) month in general. Unlike the other Kāmarūpa-

---

[1] P. I. folio 50, Ms. No. 6A, Kamarupa-Sanskrit Sanjivani Sabha collection.

[2] Ibid, p. 2, folio 50.

[3] Ibid, p. I, folio 68.

digest-writers he supports the view that the sense of the word मास (month) without any adjective means directly the Lunar month (चान्द्रमास) when the sense of the word 'मास' conveys Solar month (सौरमास) or other than Lunar month, it does so by the secondary implication (लक्षणा).

Holding this opinion he revolted against the customary faith prevailing for long in Kāmarūpa under which the system of Solar month (सौरवाद) is in vogue till today. In consequence of introducing such an unpopular idea other social leaders and scholars of our country probably stood against him. Therefore, our author had to request them to be devoid of jealousy and to pay an impartial attention to the view put forth in his work which really does not go against the Śāstras :—

"इति शास्त्राविरोधेन नीलाम्बरावबोधिते।
दत्तावधानं धीमन्तो भवन्तु गतमत्सराः॥"[4]

Hence, it follows that *Nīlāmbarācārya* flourished in *Kāmarūpa*.

The date of *Nīlāmbarācārya* can be settled to be somewhere in the second half of the 13th century A.D. As his name and works have been mentioned by prominent digest-writers on *Dharmaśāstra* of Bengal and Assam.....*Śūlapāṇi* (between 1375 and 1460 A.D.) in *Durgotsavaviveka*, *Govindānanda* (between 1500—1540 A.D.) in *Śuddhi-Kaumudī*, *Raghunandana* (between 1510—1565 A.D.) in *Yajurvedīya Śrāddha-Tatva*, *Malamāsa-Tatva* etc. *Dāmodara Miśra* (between 1410—1460 A.D.) in *Smṛtisāgarasāra*, *Pītāmbara Siddhāntavāgīśa* (between 1550—1610 A.D.) in *Śrāddhakaumudī*, *TithiKaumudī* etc. and *Śambhunātha Miśra* (between 1620—1670 A. D.) in *Varṣa-bhāskara* etc. From all these it follows that *Nīlāmbarācārya* cannot be later than the first half of the 14 century A.D. Since *Nīlāmbara* mentions *Kalpataru* (between 1100—1150 A.D.) *Jīmūtavāhana* (between 1090—1130 A.D.) *Kāmadhenu* (between 1100—1150 A.D.) *Govindarāja* (between 1050—1080 A.D.) *Paśupati*

[4] *Kāla-Kaumudī*, p. 2 folio 21, Ms. No. 7, K. S. S. Collection.

(between 1170—1200 A. D.)[5] and *Bhavadeva* (between 1175—1200 A.D.)[6] he cannot be earlier than the first half of the 13th century A.D.

In the '*Śrāddha-bhāṣya*' the author discussing about intercalary month, tells us that "*Jīmūtavāhana* raises an objection regarding the irregularity in the occurance of an intercalary month when the sun remains in the *Tulā rāśi*. Such an irregularity had taken place in *Śaka* 955".

This problem he has solved by declaring that month as intercalary. On this, *Nīlāmbarācārya* remarks that "we have seen a similar irregularity in *Śaka* 1199.

"अस्माभिस्तु एतादृश एव व्यभिचारोऽब्दैकन्यूनद्वादशशतकशकाब्दे दृष्टः"[7]।

From this we can conclude without hesitation that the author lived in *Śaka* 1199, equivalent to 1277 A.D.

---

[5] The dates of the authors excepting three Assamese writers viz., *Dāmodara Miśra*, *Pitāmbara Siddhāntavāgīśa* and *Śambhūnātha Miśra* have been put here from the "History of Dharmasastra" by M. M. P. V. Kane.

[6] In the "History of Dharmasastra," Mahāmahopādhyāya Kane says that "It appears that he (*Bhavadeva Bhatta*) was quoted in *Karmōpadeśinī* of *Aniruddha* (India office Cat. No. 1853, p. 474). But that Ms. is bound up with another work by a later author and the reference in the Cat. is not quite clear". In this connection we beg to state that in the Library of the K. S. S. at Nalbari, we have got a Ms. of a work, by the name of "*Aśaucanirūpaṇa*" of *Bhavadeva Bhaṭṭa* who is styled as a *Bālavalabhī-bhujaṅga* therein. The subject of the work is *Aśauca* (impurity after death and birth) as its name '*Aśauca-nirūpaṇa*' implies. Since *Bhavadeva Bhaṭṭa* clearly mentions '*Hāralatā*' of *Aniruddha Bhaṭṭa* in this work as—

"ग्रामाभिमुखं प्रेतं निर्हरेयुरिति हारलता (धृत) स्मृतेः"।

(P. I, fol. 38, Ms. No. 11, K. S. S. collection), he cannot be placed earlier than *Aniruddha Bhaṭṭa*. It is also noteworthy that *Nīlāmbara* in his '*Kālakaumudī*' frequently quotes the view of *Bhavadeva* in connection with the appropriate time for the performance of different *Vratas* as :—

"भवदेवेनात्रोक्तं यद्येतन्माघसप्तम्यां नारभ्यते तदोत्तरायणा (?) नन्तरं पुन्नामधेयनक्षत्रे रविवारेण शुक्लसप्तम्यामनुसन्धेयमिति।"

(P. 2, folio, II, Ms. No. 7, K. S. S. collcetion)

It indicates that *Bhavadeva Bhaṭṭa* had composed a treatise on *Kāla* similar to '*Kāla-viveka* of *Jīmūtavāhana* and *Kāla-Kaumudī*, of *Nīlāmbara*. Up to this time such a work of *Bhavadeva* has not been found anywhere.

[7] *Śrāddha-Bhāṣya*, p. 1. Folio 3, Ms. No. 6A. K. S. S. collection.

In this work he also informs us that he had already written a commentary on the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*. While quoting a verse from the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* he has advised the readers to go through his commentary on the Purāṇa for the meaning of the verse—

"अस्यार्थोऽस्मत्कृतविष्णुपुराणटीकायामनुसन्धेयः" ।[8]

In the *Kāla-kaumudī* we find that he has compiled it later than *Śrāddha-bhāṣya*, as in a place in the work, readers have been advised to search in the *Śrāddha-bhāṣya*

"श्राद्धभाष्ये ऽनुसन्धेयम्" ।[9] . . . . .

If we allow him at least twenty-five years for earning his scholar-ship in different branches of learning and ten years for compiling these three works (1) A commentary on the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* (2), *Śrāddha-bhāṣya* and (3) *Kāla-Kaumudī*, we can easily come to the conclusion that the author flourished between 1245 and 1280 A.D.

Anantakandalī (16th century A.D.) in his *Prāyaścitta-kalpadruma*, *Ripuñjaya* (17th century A.D.) in the *Pūrṇacandra* a big digest on *Dharma-Śāstra* belonging to Kāmarūpa School and *Candra-Kandalī* (18th century A.D.) in his *Navanīta* a digest on *Prāyaścitta* have frequently quoted *Nīlāmbarācārya's* explanation dealing with *Prāya-ścitta* as :—

(१) स्नेहाद्वा यदि वा मोहाल्लोभादज्ञानतोऽपि वा।
कुर्व्वन्त्यनुग्रहं ये तु तत् पापं तेषु गच्छति ।।

एतच्च सद्भावविषयम् । तत्कालानयनासमर्थे समर्थाभावे च असंख्यातेनैवा-(?)नेतव्यः। इति चन्द्रप्रभायां नीलाम्वराचार्य्यैर्लिखितं न तु वचनं दत्तमिति नातिरम-णीयं पश्यामः ।" [10]

(२) आपस्तम्वः।
दमने दामने चैव संहते चैव योजने।
स्तम्बशृङ्खलपाशैर्व्वा मृते पादोनमाचरेत् ।।

---

[8] Ibid., p. 1, fol. 69.

[9] Kāla K. P. 2, fol. 6, Ms. 7, K. S. S. collection.

[10] *Kalpadruma* in Ms. K. S. S. collection, folio 5, p. 1.

दमने स्वकृते गवां हलवाहनयोग्यतापादने, दामने प्रयोज्यद्वारेण कृत इति नीलाम्बरेण चन्द्रप्रभायां व्याख्यातम्।"[11]

(३) "शूद्रस्य सुरापाने तु ज्ञानतोऽपि न मरणान्तिकम्, किन्तु ब्राह्मणस्य चतुर्थभागापेक्षया त्रैवार्षिकं नीलाम्बरादिभिराचार्यैर्लिखितम्।"[12]

From these it is clear that *Nīlāmbarācārya* compiled another digest on *prāyaścitta* also which was named *Candraprabhā*. But the Ms. of such a work by *Nīlāmbarācārya* has nowhere been found so for. We are studying his compilations which we have got in mss.

No other means we have got to know about his commentary on the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* except his own reference to it in the *Śrāddhabhāṣya*, quoted above.

A few years ago, plenty of Mss. of his *Kāla-Kaumudī* and *Śrāddhabhāṣya* were available in different familes of our province. But during this unfortunate time, all those Mss. have been lost through damages caused by fire, water, rats, insects, natural decay. But it is more due to the negligence and ignorance of the owners.

Through a great deal of efforts we have collected here two Mss. of the *Śrāddhabhāṣya* and only one Ms. of the *Kālakaumudī*.

They also are so worn out that in some places it has become impossible to find out its proper readings.

The first Ms. of the *Śrāddhabhāṣya* has been received from Pandit Pratap Chandra Goswami, *Vidyāviśārada*, *Dharmabhūṣaṇa*, president of the Kamarup Sanskrit Sanjīvanī Sabha at Nalbari, Kamarup and the second has been borrowed by myself from Pandit Gopal Chandra Śarmā of *Bāhajānī* of Kamarupa.

Both the Mss. are written in old Assamese script and are not free from errors. The first Ms. is bound up with the Ms. of the *Divyatattva* by *Raghunandana Bhaṭṭācārya*. The total

---

[11] *Pūrnachandra* Ms. K. S. S. collection, folio No. 17, p. 1.

[12] *Navanīta* in Ms. K. S. S. collection folio No. 6, p. 1.

The number of folios of the two mss. is 70, of these the ms. of *Śrāddhabhāṣya* contains 41 folios of "*Tālapāta*" measuring about $1\frac{1}{2}'' \times 2\frac{1}{2}''$ having seven lines in a page and 2 ślokas or 64 letters in each line. It was copied in the month of *Kārtika*, śaka 1630 (1708 A.D.)[13]

The mss. do not contain the name of the persons who had copied them.

The second Ms. of the same work has 42 folios made of ordinary paper, measuring about $1\frac{1}{2}'' \times 3''$, 9 lines in one page and two ślokas in a line. It was copied by one *Vācaspati Śarman* in the month of *Bhādra* in śaka 1785 (1863 A.D.).[14]

The work is a commentary or *Bhāṣya* on the *Śrāddhakalpasūtras* of *Kātyāyana*. There are four *Kāṇḍas* or chapters dealing respectively with *Pārvaṇa Śrāddha*, *Ekoddiṣṭa Śrāddha*, *Sapiṇḍana* and *Bṛddhi Śrāddha*.

The following authors and works have been mentioned here :—

लघुहारीतः, ज्योतिःशास्त्रम्, ब्रह्मगुप्ताचार्यः, भारतम्, ज्योतिःपराशरः, हारीतः, बृहस्पतिः, विष्णुधर्म्मोत्तरम्, विष्णुः, कुथुमिः, ऋष्यशृङ्गः, शातपथीश्रुतिः, मनुः, मत्स्यपुराणम्, मार्कण्डेयः, शंखः, ब्रह्मपुराणम्, शाकटायनः, भविष्यपुराणम्, श्रुतिः, महाभारतम्, मरीचिः, स्वल्पमत्स्यपुराणम्, छन्दोगपरिशिष्टम्, ब्रह्माण्डपुराणम्, सूर्यसिद्धान्तः, वायुपुराणम्, देवीपुराणम्, गोतमः, मार्कण्डेयपुराणम्, देवलः, कात्यायनः, वशिष्ठः, व्यासः, याज्ञवल्क्यः, विष्णुपुराणम्, कूर्म्मपुराणम्, अग्निपुराणम्, बौधायनः, कार्ष्णाजिनिः, यमः, गोभिलः, वृद्धशातातपः, सांख्यायनगृह्यम्, सांख्यायनः, शंखलिखितौ, उशनाः, आपस्तम्वः, बृहत्प्रचेताः, जाबालः, आश्वलायनगृह्यपरिशिष्टम्, वाराहपुराणम्, पारस्करः, पैठीनसिः, भागवत, प्रचेताः, लोगाक्षिः, कात्यायनगृह्यम्, शौनकः, जातुकर्णः, बैजवापः, परमेष्ठी, जीमूतवाहनः, गोविन्दराजः, शंखधरः, मिताक्षरा, धनञ्जयः, श्राद्धबन्धकृत्, कामधेनुः, कल्पतरुः, उपाध्यायः, गंगाधरः, पशुपतिः, भानूपाध्यायः, लक्ष्मणोपाध्यायः, दीपिकाकृत्, कर्कोपाध्यायः, and मञ्जरीकारः।

---

13 मास कार्त्तिक। शक १६३०। दुर्गायै नमः। (Ms. No. 6A, p. 2, folio 70.)

14 वानाष्टबालेन्दुयुतेनभस्ये श्रीयुक्तवाचष्पतिशर्म्मणैतत्।
लिखन् (?) मुदा विप्रवरेण सम्यक् पक्षेऽसिते पर्वणि श्राद्धभाष्यम्॥
श्रीगुरवे नमः। Last folio, Ms. 6B.

The author begins his work with the following *Ślokas* :—

ब्रह्मधर्म्मप्रकाशार्था यस्यामी वेदराशयः ।
षड्भिरङ्गैर्युताः श्वासाः ब्रह्म तच्छ्रेयसेऽस्तु नः ।
गजाननस्यादिविसर्गकाले स्तोत्रं विधात्रा विहितं निशम्य ।
हर्षात् प्रवृत्तानि शुभावहानि निघ्नन्तु विघ्नं गुरुबृंहितानि ॥
कात्यायनेन मुनिना यदगादिमहार्थवत् ।
श्राद्धसूत्रमतिस्पष्टैर्विवृणोमि पदैरहम् ॥
तस्य तावदादिमं सूत्रमिदम् "अपरपक्षे श्राद्धं कुर्व्वीत ।"

He ends the first, second and third *Kāṇḍas* adding a verse composed by himself. They are given below respectively :—

(१) नानामुनीन्द्रवचनैरुपबृंहितायां
कात्यायनीयनयकोविदसुप्रणीतः ।
तिष्ठत्वनल्पबुधमानसबोधनाय
श्राद्धप्रकाशविषये प्रथमोऽथ काण्डः ॥

(२) श्राद्धप्रकाशसंज्ञेऽस्मिन् भाष्ये कात्यायनस्य तु ।
विवेचितमिदं श्राद्धमेकोद्दिष्टमशेषतः ॥

(३) सपिण्डीकरणं श्राद्धं श्रीमत्कात्यायनोदितम् ।
स्मृतिन्यायाविरोधेन सम्यगत्र निरूपितम् ॥

The concluding verses and the colophon of the work run thus :—

स्वःसिन्धुसिन्धोः परितः समागमे त्यजन्नसून् संसृतिमप्यहासीत् ।
यस्य क्रियां वीक्ष्य विपश्चितोऽपि सत्यम्वदन्ति स्म महर्षिचेष्टाम् ॥
आसीदसीमवसुधामरमुख्यभूतः सत्कर्म्मणां प्रवरपात्रतया प्रसिद्धः ।
संकर्षणेति विदितः प्रथितोरुकीर्त्तिमुद्योतयन् सुकृतिनां प्रथमावतारः ॥

तस्यात्मजः सकलशास्त्रपरायणोऽपि
यः पक्षपातमधिकं कृतवान् कृतीन्द्रः ।
आन्विक्षिकी रहसि तेन विनिर्म्मितेय-
मास्तां तमोऽपनयने पितृकर्म्मदीपः ॥

इति नीलाम्बराचार्य विरचितं श्राद्धभाष्यं समाप्तम् ॥

Mahāmahōpādhyāya Kane writes in the 'History of Dharmasastra' (section 72, p. 301) from the Bombay

Branch, Royal Asiatic Society Cat. No. 518, p. 170 that "on the *Śrāddha Kalpasūtra* of *Kātyāyana* a commentary called *prakāśa* was composed by *Halāyudha* son of *Saṅkarṣaṇa*. Probably in the Ms. of this work assigned in the catalogue, *Nilāmbara* is represented as *Halāyudha* through mistake. *Halāyudha* and *Nīlāmbara* are the names of *Valabhadra*, elder-brother of the Great *Śrī Kṛṣṇa*. This is probably due to the confusion regarding the names on the part of the copist. Only one Ms. of *Kāla-kaumudī* composed by *Nīlāmbarācārya* has been obtained somehow from Ramesh Chandra Goswami of *Bāli Satra*, Kamarupa. It is written in old Assamese script and contains 32 folios made of *Tālapāta* measuring about $1\frac{1}{2} \times 3\frac{1}{2}$", bearing eleven lines in a page and three ślokas in a line. It has been so old and worn out that line after line has been swept away in many places. Moreover the first folio of the Ms. is missing.

The *Kāla-Kaumudī* as its name implies, contains discussions as to the appropriate seasons, months and times for the performance of religious rites and duties. The determination of different kinds of months, intercalary months, the question whether the month for certain festivals and rites is to be Solar (सौर) or Lunar (चान्द्र). Proper time for the various *vratas* including *Śivarātri*, *Sāvitrī*, *Rohiṇyāṣṭamī*, *Ekādaśī*, *Cāturmāsya*, etc. various festivals viz. *Durgotsava*, *Kojāgarā*, etc. and various religious duties as the cessation and starting of Vedic studies, उत्सर्ग and उपाकर्म्म, *Navānna*, etc. with their short procedure, is discussed there. The author mentions here the following *Smṛtikāras*, *Nibandhakāras* and works :—

साम्बपुराणम्, स्मृतिसमुच्चय :, पद्मपुराणम्, गौतमभाष्यम्, विष्णुधर्म्मोत्तरम्, गृह्यपरिशिष्टम्, लघुहारीत :, देवल:, परिशिष्टम्, बौधायन:, भविष्यपुराणम्, स्कन्दपुराणम्, जाबाल :, तन्त्रटीकाकृत् (तन्त्रवार्त्तिकम्), ब्रह्मगुप्त :, वराह :, पितामह:, ब्रह्मसिद्धान्त :, पारस्कर :, ब्रह्मपुराणम्, शंख:, विष्णु :, मत्स्यपुराणम्, यम :, महाभारतम्, माण्डव्य :, बृहस्पति :, वायुपुराणम्, मनु:, ऋष्यश्रृंग:, कुथुमि:, कालिकापुराणम्, पराशर :, काश्यप :, देवीपुराणम्, महार्णव :, ज्योतिषम्, वशिष्ठ:, व्यास :,

बद्धशातातप:, गोतम:, छन्दोगपरिशिष्टम्, शिवरहस्यम्, नरसिंहपुराणम् वाराहपुराणम्, अर्कतन्त्रम्, बाहुलतन्त्रम्, मरीचि:, लिंगपुराणम्, स्मृतिमीमांसा, नारदीयपुराणम्, सौरधर्म्मोत्तरम्, स्मृतिमहार्णव:, काश्यपपंचरात्रम्, सत्य:, वामनपुराणम्, आदिपुराणम्, मार्कण्डेय:, याज्ञवल्क्य:, शाट्यायन:, बृहन्मनु:, जातुकर्ण:, कार्ष्णाजिनि:, कौत्स:, स्वल्पमत्स्यपुराणम्, पैठीनसि:, कात्यायन:, लक्ष्मीधर:, कल्पतरु:, कृत्यसागरकार:, जीमूतवाहन:, भानूपाध्याय:, भवदेव: शंखधर:, व्रतसागरकार:, कामधेनुकृत्, सम्वत्सरप्रदीप:, गोविन्दराज:, धनञ्जय: श्राद्धबन्धकार: लक्ष्मणोपाध्याय:।

As the first folio of the Ms. is lost, we could not find the opening ślokas of the work.

The concluding verses and the colophon are given below as far as I could read them.

स्मार्तार्थनिष्ठार्थविशेषनिष्ठो
विशेषविज्ञानचयास्यराति: (?)।
अभूदभूतार्थकृति: कृती क:
संकर्षणाख्यो भुवि भूमिदेव:॥
.. ..कादिविनिर्म्मल:।
तस्माज्जज्ञे महाप्राज्ञ: श्रीमन्नीलाम्बर: कृती॥
तातादधीत्याखिलमानवादि-
स्मृतिषु (शास्त्रेषु (?)) सर्व्वासु (सर्व्वेषु (?)) गत: प्रतिष्ठाम्।
चकार शास्त्रार्थविशेषवेत्ता
स कौमुदीं कालविवेचनार्थाम्॥
सत्स्वप्युपनिष ....स च।
वलभद्र..........प्रीत्यै कृतेयं कालकौमुदी॥

इति नीलाम्बराचार्यकृता कालकौमुदी समाप्ता॥

Another work in Ms. called '*Śrāddharatna*' composed by one *Nīlāmbara* has been received from Pandit Ramanīkānta Vedavyākaraṇa Shastri of Nāgārkuchi, Kamarup. It is also a commentary on the *Kātyāyana Śrāddha Sūtra*. The colophon of the work shows that it is only a part of the great work named "*Nītiviveka*" composed by the same author.

It is not possible for one person to compose two separate commentaries on the same work. Moreover, the

style of composition and view which have been taken up in the work differ from those of *Nīlāmbarācārya.* So it follows that the authors are two different persons.

The introductory verses of this work are :—

दुर्गामदुर्गां दुर्गार्तिनाशिनीं दुर्गदुर्गमाम् ।
नमामि सामिसयये कुले शम्भोः स्थितां रते ।।

परकीयगुणलेशं तन्वन्ति ये बुधाः वराः ।
तेषां पुष्पोदरापूर्णं करयुग्मं सदास्तु नः ।।

श्राद्धरत्नमिदं नाम निर्म्मितं मयका बुधाः ।
प्रचारयध्वं सर्व्वत्र सुधियो मदनुग्रहात् ।।

श्रीकात्यायनो हेणि (?) जंयतीह जगद् भ्रदे ।
नीतिसन्धानसूत्रेण करेणा (?) नीतिकृत्तमः ।।

सूत्राण्येतानि वै श्राद्धमार्गसम्पादकानि च ।
विप्रनीलाम्बरेणात्र लघुबुद्धिहितैषिणा ।।

सुप्रमेयैः सुसम्बद्धैर्मन्वाद्युद्भवयुक्तिभिः ।
नानाशास्त्रोपदेशैश्च व्याक्रियन्ते प्रयत्नतः ।।

The concluding verses and the colophon run thus :—

अनेकग्रन्थसन्दर्भैरन्यैर्व्याख्यानुगामिभिः ।
सुविस्तृतपदैर्गूढैर्व्याख्यातं श्राद्धसूरिभिः ।।

तस्मान्नीलाम्बरेणैतत् श्राद्धतन्त्रं सुशोभनैः ।
पदैः स्पष्टतरैः सारैः संक्षिप्तनीतिसारिभिः ।।

इति श्रीनीलाम्बरकृतौ नीतिविवेके श्राद्धरत्नकाण्डो नाम प्रथमः समाप्तः ।।

The following works and *smṛtikāras* are mentioned here in this work :—

विष्णुधर्म्मोत्तरम्, बौधायनः, बृहस्पतिः, लघुहारीतः, साम्बपुराणम्, ब्रह्मपुराणम्, मत्स्यपुराणम्, वायुपुराणम्, गौतमः, आदिपुराणम्, मनुः, स्मृतिः, विष्णुपुराणम्, देवलः, याज्ञवल्क्यः, बृहत्प्रचेताः, विश्वामित्रः, यमः, विष्णुः, शंखः, पितामहः, जातुकर्णः, शाट्यायनः, ज्योतिः, पराशरः, भविष्यपुराणम्, महार्णवः, मार्कण्डेयः, छन्दोगपरिशिष्टम्, आश्वलायनः, शातातपः, कात्यायनः, बृहद्यमः, जाबालः, प्रचेताः, ऋष्यश्रृंगः, पारस्करः, ज्यौतिःशास्त्रम्, हारीतः, पैठीनसिः, .गोभिलः, भानुः (भानूपाध्यायः) बहवृचगृह्यपरिशिष्टम्, श्रुतिः, वराहसंहिता, मार्कण्डेयपुराणम्, and विष्णुरहस्यम् ।

There is a tradition among the local Sanskrit scholars that this Nilāmbara was the brother of the famous digest-writer Pitāmbara Sidhāntavāgiśa the autor of 18 *Kaumudīs* who flourished between 1550 aud 1610 A.D.

The Ms. of *Śrāddharatna* which we have found here contains 14 folios made of *Sancibark*, measuring about $1\frac{1}{3}' \times 3''$, 11 line in one page and $2\frac{1}{2}$ ślokas in each line. There is no reference as to when and by whom it was copied. It is written in old Assamese script and is not free from errors.

VIṢA-KANYĀ OR POISON-GIRL—AN INSTRUMENT OF POLITICAL MURDER

By DR. H. VEDANTASASTRI

MURDER, however despisable it might have been in the eyes of Religion, Society or Law, has not failed to exact the sanction of the authors of Polity, provided it has been backed by some political motive. Both Śukra and Kauṭilya approve of it and in their opinion, political authorities of a country are perfectly justified in resorting to this henious crime. They have also pointed out various instruments of political murder and quite a novel form of the same is to be found in the *Mudrā-rākṣasam* a purely political drama, composed by Prince Viśākhadatta in circa 500 A.D. So says Prof. Nagendra Nath Ghosh, author of "*Early History of India.*" It is Viṣa-Kanyā—Poison-girl. The only other book, so far known in which mention is made of the same, is the *Kathā-Sarit-Sāgara*—by Somadeva of the eleventh century. The bare fact underlying the said episode is that the crafty Brāhmaṇa, Viṣṇugupta Cāṇakya invoked the aid of a king of the hilly region, on promise of a half-share of the Indian Empire, in order to exterminate the Nandas, in the interest of Chandragupta; but on the completion of business, he got rid of his ally by having effected his murder through Viṣa-Kanyā.

Now what is this Viṣa-Kanyā? So many problems or curiosities confront us in this matter. They may be arranged in the following order :—

(1) Is the "Kanyā" a real or an artificial one? Or in other words —is the Kanyā of flesh-and-blood made or is it a mere image, made of clay, wood or any other substance?

(2) What is the relation of Viṣa *i.e.* poison with the Kanyā? Saṁyoga or Samavāya?

(3) If Saṁyoga, then is it direct or indirect?

(4) Has the word Viṣa-Kanyā a technical sense?

(5) In which manner was the murder effected?

In this humble paper, an attempt has been made to test the Poison-girl, that is, to judge the implication of the term from all possible points of view.

Let me state first, that the term may have a simple meaning—as gathered from the connotation of the two words—namely Viṣa and Kanyā, with proper adjustment of the relation between the two—as dictated by the nature of the compound; or it may have some technical sense; and let us take first the technical sense for consideration. In Astrology, a woman, born under certain "conditions," is termed a Viṣāṅganā or Viṣa-Kanyā; and as regards the conditions, the authorities are by no means consentient. Thus one section enumerates the conditions as follows :—

(1) A woman born on a Sunday, in the Dwitīyā-tithi with Aśleṣā constellation,
(2) or on a Saturday, in the Saptamī-tithi under the constellation of Kṛttikā,
(3) or on a Tuesday, in the Dwādaśī-tithi, under the constellation of Śatabhiṣā,

is to be designated as Viṣa-Kanyā. As regards the tithis and constellations, there is also difference of opinion.

Other section holds that a woman is to be called a Viṣa-Kanyā, provided her lagna contains the Saturn, the fifth house is occupied by the Sun and the ninth house by Mars.

Yet, a third section argues that the lagna, being the inimical house of two auspicious planets, which occupy it, together with an inauspicious one, makes a woman—Viṣa-Kanyā; and the result of a woman's turning out to be a Viṣa-Kanyā is that she is to lose her husband—very likely in the prime of her life.

Thus from the astrological point of view, a Viṣa-Kanyā is nothing but an unfortunate or rather a doomed girl. Certainly such a woman is not implied by the term Viṣa-Kanyā as used in the *Mudrā-rākṣasa*, inasmuch as, contact—*i.e.* physical contact with such a woman does not bring about immediate death and it was immediate death—that befell the unlucky king of the hills, whom Cāṇakya wanted to finish, in the interest of Candra Gupta.

Thus the Viṣa-Kanyā of the *Mudrā-rākṣasa* has no technical sense.

Now let us consider, whether the Kanyā or Viṣa-Kanyā is a real or an artificial one. It is not unlikely that a life-like human size woman made of earth or wood or any other substance, fully dressed and decorated, but annointed with some kind of poison was placed in the bed-chamber of Parvataka—so was the name of the unfortunate Prince. The Prince was under the influence of intoxication, and feeling passionate rushed to the aforesaid image, kissed it and as a result met his death through the infiltration of poison into his mouth. That such an incident is probable, is to be inferred from the writings of the immortal poet Kālidāsa. He says in his *Meghadūtam* :—"कामार्ता हि प्रकृतिकृपणाश्चेतनाचेतनेषु" *i.e.* passionate fellows often lose the power of discriminating between animate and inanimate; and during his separation from Sītā, so says the poet in his *Raghuvaṁśa*, the love-born Rāmacandra rushed to embrace the branch of an Aśoka tree, under the impression that it was Sītā, the impression being caused by the similarity of the blossoms of flowers of the tree and breasts of a woman. Hence the probability of the Viṣakanyā being but an image cannot be ruled out; and if it had been so, then the relation of Viṣa with the Kanyā is certainly one of the Saṁyoga type. But me-seems it is unlikely—since the probability of the Kanyā, being a real one appears to be stronger than it being an artificial one.

Commenting upon a verse of the seventh chapter of the *Manu-Saṁhitā*, Kullūka Bhaṭṭa quotes the following :—

अस्त्रेण वेणीविनिगूहितेन विदूरथम् स्वमहिषी जघान विषप्रदिग्धेन च नूपुरेण देवी विरक्ता किलकाभिराजम् ।

Two incidents are couched up in the verse. One, the Queen of Bidūratha, a king, killed him, with a weapon (very likely a sharp knife), kept concealed in her dishevelled hair; and two, The Queen—or rather the chief queen, displeased with her husband, the King of Kāśī, killed him with the help of her anklet, besmeard with poison. The first incident is not a solitary case. The Siyar-ul-mutakherin records that the daughter of Hafiz Rahamat Khan, the Rohilla chief, when forced into the bed-chamber of Suja-uddaulah, the Nawab-Vizier of Oudh, dealt a fatal blow with a dagger, kept concealed in the dress, at the feet of the Nawab Vizier, to which, points out Haji Mustafa, the translator of the work, he succumbed a few days after. Of course, poison had no part to play in these cases. But the second incident clearly bespeaks of poison, applied to some particular ornament, with which the murder was effected. Here, the relation of poison with the murderer—*i.e.*, the Kanyā, is also one of Saṁyoga type—but this Saṁyoga is not direct—but indirect; the ornaments, serving as a connecting link between the two. And, it is not improbable, that the murderer of Parvataka was effected in like manner. Some Kanyā (said to have been Viṣakanyā, on account of her being in possession of a poisonous ornament) had dalliance with the intoxicated prince, and finished him with poison, kept in some ornament of hers, at the first opportunity, she could catch hold of. At least, such a presumption can not be altogether ruled out.

And there is a fourth alternative. Some particular types of women, can be termed Viṣa-Kanyā from the physiological point of view. Upon this, two verses, collected bv me run as follows :—

(१) यदंगम् नाभिवाञ्च्छन्ति मक्षिका वा जलौकसः। मशकाश्च तथैवान्ये ताम् नारीम् विषवत् त्यजेत्। A variant reading of this runs in this wise :—यदंगम् नाभिवाञ्च्छन्ति मशका वा जलायुधः। मक्षिकाश्च स्त्रियम् ताम् वै नोपगच्छेत् कदाचन।"

(२) यदंगप्रस्रावेनैव म्रियन्ते कृमिकंचुकाः। पिपीलिकाश्च कीटाश्च ताम् नारीम् विषवत् त्यजेत्। A variant reading is :—यन्मूत्रतेजसा भौमा म्रियन्ते च महीलताः। पिपीलिकाश्च कीटाश्च ताम् नारीम् विषवत् त्यजेत्।" That is, there are some kinds of woman, whose bodies are never affected by flies, mosquitoes and leech. They refuse to suck blood from their bodies; and under the pressure of their urine, insects, ants and earth-worms die—so venomous is their urine. Such women are veritable Viṣakanyās and one should not come in physical touch with them. It is not improbable that such a Viṣa-Kanyā was despatched to Parvataka, and as a result of his coming in physical contact with her, Parvataka courted his death. But the difficulty is that death in such a case does not appear to be immediate. Infection, no doubt, occurs immediately; but it is doubtful—whether death follows in quick succession; it may take some time in overcoming the victim. Hence the assumption, namely, that such a Viṣa-Kanyā was the instrument of murder in the *Mudrārākṣasa*, may, perhaps, be ruled out. And yet there is a fifth alternative—perhaps the most cogent one.

In his "*Suvarṇadwīpa*"*, Dr. R. C. Majumdar writes the following :—

"The New History of the T'ang Dynasty gives a somewhat more detailed account of Java," and one of this runs in the following way :—

"In this country, there are poisonous girls; when one has intercourse with them, he gets painful ulcers and dies; but his body does not decay."

Thus there was a kind of Viṣa-Kanyā in the island of Java and an intercourse with her effected immediate death;

---

* Vol. II, page 252.

or rather, in case of an intercourse with her, death is not delayed. It is highly probable, that such a girl was already procured by the crafty Brāhmaṇa Cāṇakya and sent unto Parvataka to effect his death.

Now summing up, we get five alternatives :—

(1) An astrological Viṣa-Kanyā was sent to Parvataka. It can be safely ruled out.

(2) A physiological Viṣa-Kanyā; it may also be ruled out.

(3) A physiological Viṣa-Kanyā of the virulent type, procured from Java.

(4) A girl—with one of her ornaments, stuffed with poison.

(5) A poisoned image of an youthful woman.

And though anyone of the last three is likely, it appears to me highly probable that the third one, namely a Javanese poisonous girl was used by Cāṇakya as the instrument of murder, and in view of the fact that India had, in those days, intercourse with the outside world, it may be said that to procure such a girl was not a difficult task for Cāṇakya.

GĀṄGEYADEVA OF TĪRABHUKTI

By SHRI RADHA KRISHNA CHOUDHARY

MAHĀMAHOPĀDHYĀYA V. V. Mirashi, in his learned article "Gāṅgeyadeva of Tīrabhukti" published in the Silver Jubilee Volume of the Annals of Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Observes :—

(a) "Gangeyadeva of Tirabhukti is likely to have been a King of the Rāstrakuta dynasty."[1]

(b) "The existing data for the history of North-eastern India do not at least preclude the possibility of the Rāstrakuta King of that name who claimed descent from the moon and assumed the title of Mahārājādhirāja and the Viruda Puṇyāvaloka, ruling over Mithilā and the adjoining territory in the beginning of the 11th century A. D."[2]

The basis of his conclusion is the matrimonial alliance of Rājyapāla (911-35) with the Rāṣṭrakūṭa princess Bhāgyadevī, who was the daughter of a Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Tuṅga[3] whom, Mirashi identifies with Tuṅga Dharmāvaloka who has left an inscription at Buddha-Gayā. This is not dated but is referred to in the 10th century A. D.[4] The question of the identification of this Rāṣṭrakūṭa Tuṅga is still controversial. Tuṅga is identified with Jagattuṅga, son of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king, Krishna II, who died in 914 A. D.[5] Jagatuṅga predeceased his father and never ascended the throne. His son Indra III succeeded Krishna II. Tuṅga thus seems to be a contemporary of Nārāyaṇapāla, father of Rājyapāla

[1] Page 300.

[2] Page 301.

[3] *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XIV, p. 324.

[4] R. L. Mitra.—"*Buddh-gaya*"—pl. XL, p. 195.

[5] *G. A. S. B.* (1892) Part I, p. 80; Altekar "Rastrakutas", p. 90.

The identification of Tuṅga Dharmāvaloka and Jagattuṅga is still a matter of controversy. We do not find any mention of Tirhut, Tīrabhukti or Mithilā in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa records. Nor is there any ample proof to show that the Rāṣṭrakūṭas ever extended their sway beyond Magadha. The possibility of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king of the name of Gāṅgeyadeva, therefore, does not stand on sound footing. During the time of Rājyapāla, the Gurjara crossed the Soṇa river and in the north overran Tirhut.[6] We do not find the mention of any Rāṣṭrakūṭa king in any record of the 11th century A. D. ruling in Tirhut and the question of Rāṣṭrakūṭa Gāṅgeyadeva[7] does not arise unless any record is put forward.

The whole question of Gāṅgeyadeva of Tīrabhukti centres round the discovery of a colophon of the *Rāmāyaṇa* manuscript, discovered by Bendall and that particular colophon has been subjected to various interpretations[8]. Bendall drew our attention towards "Gāṅgeyadeva of Tīrabhukti". He identified this Gāṅgeyadeva with the Kālāchuri king, but examined in the light of new facts, this identification does not stand. The year given in the manuscript is saṁvat 1076 but as the colophon does not specify the era to which it belongs and does not mention any week-day, etc., it does not admit of verification. But before coming to any conclusion, we should be cautious to note here that there is no epigraphic evidence to prove that Gāṅgeyadeva Kālāchuri ever ruled over Tirhut. Simple mention in the colophon is not a sure ground for history. The identification with Kālāchuri Gāṅgeyadeva has been rightly questioned by scholars on the following grounds[9] :—

---

[6] Allen, "*Cambridge Shorter History of India*," p. 144; Ray, *DHNI*—Vol. I, p. 305.

[7] I discussed the question of Rāṣṭrakūṭa dominion in Tirhut with Dr. Altekar. He told me that there was nothing to prove Rāṣṭrakūṭa domination in Tirhut.

[8] *J. A. S. B.* Vol. LXXII, (1903) p. 1, f, 1.

[9] Levi, *Nepal*, Vol. 2, p. 202 F.N. 1.

(i) That the Kālāchuris never used the title Avaloka. It was used by the Rāṣṭrakūṭas.

(ii) Gauḍadhwaja indicates some political authority of Gāṅgeyadeva in Gauḍa, but Kālāchuri king had no pretensions to suzerainty over Bengal.

(iii) The Kālāchuris is not known to have ruled over Tirhut.

Mr. Chanda[10] has suggested that as Magadha was under the Pālas, the country to the west under Chandellas, Gāṅgeyadeva Kālāchuri could not have extended his rule to Tirhut. The term "Gauḍadhwaja" exists in the colophon towards which the attention was first drawn by Bendall. In Dr. Raghuvir's copy of the colophon,[11] there exists the word "Garuḍadhwaja" in place of "Gauḍa-dhwaja" and the word "kṛte" after "Śri Ānandasya", which is missing in Bendall's copy. This has given rise to another problem i.e. the Standard of Eagle. On the basis of both these colophons, the following facts are clear :—

(i) That Gāṅgeyadeva was ruling in Tīrabhukti in the year 1076 of an unspecified era.

(ii) He bore the title of Mahārājādhirāja and the Viruda Puṇyāvaloka.

(iii) He belonged to the Lunar race.

(iv) Gauḍadhwaja (in Bendall) and Garuḍadhwaja (in Dr. Raghubir's copy).

Mm. Mirashi also does not regard the identification of Gāṅgeyadeva with Kālāchuri king as tenable[12]. Dr. R. D. Banerjee contradicts himself about Gāṅgeyadeva. On the one hand he accepts that Gāṅgeyadeva attacked

---

[10] *Gauḍarājamālā*, p. 42 F.N.

[11] Produced in the Fourth Session of the Indian History Congress at Lahore and referred to by Mm. Mirashi in his above-quoted article.

[12] Mirashi—*op. cit.* 297.

Bengal and occupied Mithilā[13] in Mahīpāla's reign, while in the same strain he is of opinion that Mahīpāla occupied Vārendra, Tīrabhukti, Magadha and Banaras. It was before the forty-eighth year of his reign that Mahīpāla occupied Tirhut because various bronze images of his reign have been discovered in Tirhut[14]. The Inādpur Image inscription reads—"Śrimāna Mahīpāladevarājasya Saṁatta 48 jeṣṭha dina śuklapakṣa". He was the second founder of the fortune of the Pālas and is said to have come into conflict with Gāṅgeyadeva Kālāchuri. Mahīpāla conquered Tirhut and Banaras[15]. It is evident that it was Mahīpāla (992—1040) who ruled over Mithilā and not Gāṅgeyadeva Kālāchuri.

The whole trouble lies in fixing the date of the manuscript. As the era is not specified and there is no mention of any week-day, it is really difficult to ascertain the date. For the Kālāchuri domination over Tirhut in the 11th century A. D. we have no records. Even the Gohārwā Copperplate[16]. of Karṇadeva (son of Gāṅgeyadeva) does not say anything about Gāṅgeyadeva's dominion in Tirhut. During that period Pāla domination over Tirhut was an established fact. The Pāla domination extended upto Kāśī as is evident from the Sāranāth Stone inscription[17].

Mm. Mirashi also rejects the theory of Dr. R. C. Mazumdar that this Gāṅgeyadeva was the son of Nānyadeva and the year, saṁvat 1076, should be taken to mean the Śaka Era and should be fixed at 1154 A. D. Bendall, on account of the archaic nature of the writing, took it to mean the Vik-

---

[13] R. D. Banerjee, *Bānglār Itihās*, Vol. I, p. 252.

[14] Banerjee, op. cit. pp. 239-40.

[15] Ray—*DHNI*, Vol. I, pp,. 316-17. That the Pālas continued to rule over North Bihar is further corroborated by the discovery of Naulāgarh Inscription, edited and published by me (1950, Begusarai).

[16] *Ep. Indi.* Vol. XI, pp. 143-46.

[17] *Ind. Art.*, Vol. XIV, p. 139.

ram Era and fixed it at 1019 A. D.[18] Mm. Mirashi differs with Dr. R. C. Mazumdar on the following grounds:—

(i) That there is no evidence to prove that Nānya's family claimed descent from the moon and called itself Somavaṁśodbhava.

(ii) Descent is traced from the Sun.

(iii) Gāṅgeyadeva never assumed the title of Mahārājādhirāja.

(iv) In the Stone Inscription of his minister, Śrīdhara Kāyastha, Nānya is called Śrīmān.

These grounds are his weapons against the identification of Gāṅgeyadeva with Gaṅgadeva of the Karnāṭa dynasty. Firstly, let us be sure of the fact that in the year (even if we accept Bendall's fixation) it was Mahīpāla who ruled over Tīrabhukti and not Gāṅgeyadeva Kālāchuri. Secondly, the title Mahārājādhirāja is used by the scribes who write the manuscripts. The question of Viruda, ending in Avaloka, was not unknown to the Karnāṭs. Even if we read Garuḍadhwaja in place of Gauḍadhwaja, the question of Gaṅgadeva Karnāṭa's supremacy over Bengal cannot be over-looked. Though the Karnāṭs had no "Eagle Standard" (Garuḍadhwaja), we have at our disposal the old ruins of the Karnāṭa period (still unnoticed) where we find the images of Viṣṇu and Garuḍa. Even the Andharā-Ṭhāṛhī Inscription of Nānya's minister is on the pedestal of Viṣṇu named there as Kamalāditya. Similar images of Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa have been found in the Village Bheetha Bhagawānpur (Darbhanga)[19]. In a tank called Matiāhī in village Āsī

---

18 Dr. K. C. Pandey—'*Abhinavagupta* (p. 125)—wants us to support Bendall simply to suit his contention about Nānya's date. I am sure that Nānya's date requires no further elucidation as it stands verified on all scores. We cannot place Nānya in the first quarter of the eleventh century A. D.

19 Vide my paper "*Malladeva—a forgotten king of Mithilā*", Submitted to the 13th session of the Indian History Congress, Nagpur, 1950.

(Darbhanga), there is a temple of Viṣṇu and Garuḍa. These images of Viṣṇu and Garuḍa, belonging to the Karnāṭa period, were found in 1874 and the stone-slab was removed to Hāṭī Nīlakoṭhī. There is a śloka on the stone-slab[20]. It is clear that this 'Garuḍa' was not absent from the Karnāṭa tradition and the scribe, simply to glorify and praise his master, might have used the epithet 'Garuḍadhwaja.'

The writer Śrīkara may be identified with Śrīkara, founder of the Nauraṅgabali Mūla among the Karṇa Kāyasthas of Mithilā[21]. There is no mention of any Śrīkara in Mithilā Pañjī. The *Rāmāyaṇa* manuscript, in question, when written in Tīrabhukti, must have been written by the Tirhut Kāyastha, who acted as ministers and scribes of the rulers of Karnāṭa dynasty. We cannot preclude the possibility of getting the correct name Śrīkara in future. The kings of Mithilā also used the epithet "Avaloka" and we find that Nānya called himself "Dharmāvaloka" while Rāma Singh of the same dynasty had the title of Mahārājādhirāja and the Viruda "Puṇyāvaloka"[22]. Therefore, the contention of Mm. Mirashi, that the Karnāṭs of Mithilā did not use the title of Mahārājādhirāja, is unsupported. Gāṅgadeva of the Karnāṭa dynasty introduced sound administrative system and extended the power of the Karnāṭa kingdom.

He was a successful king. He introduced various reforms and got dug many tanks and erected many temples. His relation with his brother, Malladeva, the heir-apparent, was not cordial. Gāṅgadeva was a brave king. He took

---

20 जातो वंशे विल्वपञ्चाभिधाने धर्माध्यक्षो वर्धमानो भवेशात् ।
देवस्याग्रे देवयष्टिध्वजाग्रारूढ़ं कृत्वाऽस्थापयद्वै नतेयम् ॥

21 Rasbehari Das, "*Mithilā Darpaṇa*" Vol. 2, p. 18.

22 इति मिथिलामहीमहेन्द्रसमस्तप्रक्रियाविराजमानश्रीम............ वरलब्धप्रसादपुण्यावलोकमहाराजाधिराजश्रीमद्रामसिंहदेवानां सदस्यमहामहोपाध्यायश्रीश्रीकरविरचितायाममरकोषविवरणटीकायां व्याख्यामृताभिधायां भूकाण्डे........विवरणं समाप्तं । (*Nepal Darbar Catalogue*, p. 23).

revenge against the Senas and Pālas of Bengal. My contention is that after the death of Nānya, the Karnāṭa kingdom was divided into two parts and Gaṅgadeva in order to compensate the loss must have turned his attention towards Bengal, which was then in a process of political disintegration. The disorder during the reign of Madanapāla refers to an invasion of Gauḍa by the Karnāṭa ruler of Mithilā. Gaṅgadeva of Mithilā was a contemporary of Madanapāla. He probably attacked Madanapāla's kingdom with success[23]. In view of the facts given above the year 1076 should be referred back to Śaka era and taken to be equivalent to 1154 A. D., when Gaṅgadeva was ruling. Therefore instead of trying to hope for the possibility of Rāṣṭrakūṭa domination over Tirhut, we should agree with Dr. Mazumdar that it was not Gāṅgeyadeva Kālāchuri but Gaṅgadeva Karnāṭa of Tīrabhukti. Simply the word "Garuḍadhwaja" should not confuse us.

---

[23] *History of Bengal*, Ed. by Dr. R. C. Majumdar, Vol. I, p. 170.

feelings against the Sena [illegible] that [illegible] mention [illegible] after the death of Mahipala, the [illegible] was divided into two parts and Ganga[illegible] [illegible] perhaps the [illegible] must have ruled the [illegible] Bengal which was then in a process of political disintegration. [illegible] disorder during the reign of [illegible] to an [illegible] of [illegible] by the [illegible] of Mithila [illegible] Ganga[illegible] of [illegible] with a [illegible] the people [illegible] attacked Mithila [illegible] In view of the facts given above, the [illegible] referred back to [illegible] A. D. [illegible] Lakshmana [illegible] therefore instead of [illegible] the possession of [illegible] we should agree with Dr. Majumdar [illegible] Nanya[illegible] of Tirhut [illegible] brought the word [illegible] not [illegible] us.

[illegible]

FRESH LIGHT ON यदुवंश, अनुप्रविष्ट AFTER ययाति

By SHRI RAMPRASAD MAZUMDAR

FROM the standpoint of synchronistic references, यदुवंश is associated with वैवस्वतवंश, सोमवंश and its branches—which again are connected with Paurāṇic and Brāhminical dynasties or आचार्य-परम्पराs.

Col. Tod, in his '*Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthān*,' supposes that some names of the सोमवंश are missing. An effort has been made by me to fill up (all or) most of the gaps with the help of the *Mahābhārata*[1], *Matsya P.*[2], *Viṣṇu P.*[3], etc. A further light may be thrown on this problem by believing that there flourished अजमीढ़ ३य,, (४ र्थ ?) and ५म (or द्विमीढ़)—as reconstructed by me on the ground that synchronistic references do tally well specially with वैवस्वतवंश. Thus the gap is filled up. विश्वामित्र-वंश is taken according to the *Mahā B.*[4] or भागवत and "काशीराज दैवोदासि-प्रतर्दन [२य]—वंश after (वितथ or his grandson) सुहोत्र according to हरिवंश[5] or अग्नि-पु० (Eng. Tran. by M. N. Dutt).

Hitherto much attentionh as been paid to वैवस्वत— and सोमवंश, but other dynasties and especially, यदुवंश, a very important and one of the biggest dynasties, has not been taken into such consideration. In course of my studies about the various dynasties as given in the Paurāṇic and Brahmi-

---

[1] M. B.—Poona Edn. or Beng. Tran. by K. Sinha, Adiparva, ch. 94-95; Vide also Śānti Parva, ch. 150, dealing with 'The *elder* पारिक्षित अनमेजय and his priest शौनक इन्द्रोत'; cf. Ait. Br. 39.7; शत. ब्रा: 13.5.4.1 etc.

[2] Mat. P. (Ānanda—Edn.) ch. 50. In that tone, Vāyu p. (A--Edn.), Ch. 99, 207—209 sl. says, "....अजमीढः पुनर्जातः क्षीणे वंशे स सोमकः। . . ."

[3] Vi. p.—Orig. and Beng. Tran. by P. Tarkaratna, IV, ch. 19, '—द्विमीढ़वंश'

[4] M.B.—Śānti P., ch. 49. See also Śankh. Āraṇyaka—Tr. by Keith, ch. 15; Hari V. I. 32. 43.

[5] H. V.—Poona Edn. I·32. 19—Here नीलकण्ठ is confused to see 'the Fusion of Myth' or succession of similar names after सुवहोत्र (मतान्तरे सुहोत्रम) in I. 29 ch. and comments "पूर्वौ काशिक—गृत्समदौ . . . चतुर्थौ इमौ तु . . . . . एकविंशस्य सुहोत्रस्य पुत्रौ . . . ."

nical Literature and the interpretations, advanced by the historians thereon, it seems that all of them have accepted that the founder of the well known Yadu dynasty was after the son of Yayāti (and देवयानी)[6]. But after a careful study and comparisons of the texts (and of the dynasties or परम्परास which are often "प्राधान्येन तु कीर्तिताः" of the Purāṇas, it seems to me that the Yadu, after whom the Yādava dynasty is known and to which कृष्ण belonged, is another Yadu, the son of Haryaśwa and Madhumatī. In order to explain this, I give below reasons why the former view is not tenable and show all these in a chronological chart prepared by me and appended to this note.

In connection with हर्यश्व (Number 39, 'C' dynasty), father of यदु (and वसुमती or अरुण), it is said in महाभारत[7] "ततो मधुपुरं राजा हर्यश्वः स जगाम च।...मधुना दानवेन्द्रेण स साम्ना समुदाहृतः।... यायात्मपि वंशस्ते समेष्यति च यादवम्। अनुवंशं च वंशस्ते सोमस्य भविता किल॥२४॥

नीलकण्ठ comments—"यायातमपीति॥ यादवं ययातिपुत्रस्य यदोः संबन्धिनं वंशं ते तव वंशः समेष्यति प्रवेक्ष्यति। अत एव सोमस्य वंशमनु ते तव वंशः भविष्यति सूर्यवंशात्च्युतो भविष्यति इत्यर्थः। एकग्रन्थपठितत्वात् दुःसमाधेयोऽयं विरोधः। सत्यम्। तथाप्ययमत्र समाधिः—...एकः एव यदुः....योगबलेन सूर्यवंशेऽपि आविर्भूय सूर्यवंशं स्वपक्षे आनीतवान्।......"

From the above reference to the *Mahābhārata*, as interpreted by नीलकण्ठ, it becomes clear that there was a fusion between the सूर्यवंश and सोमवंश (or यादववंश). In other words, हर्यश्व also had a son named यदु. If this is accepted, then the वंश, starting from यदु, leads us to the conclusions that the four (यदुवंशीय) names 'दुर्मद', 'कार्तवीर्य अर्जुन', 'हैहय'-गण (३य) and श्रीकृष्ण (their approximate position numbers in 'B' and 'A' dynasties being 50, 53, 58 and -135) find their contemporaries in the names of प्रतर्दन, परशुराम, सगर and अभिमन्यु (their approximate position numbers being 47 or 48 or 49, 49, 60 and -139 in 'G', 'F', 'C' and 'D' dynasties) respectively.

---

[6] *Ref. Vedic Age*—Ed. by R. C. Mazumdar, 1952, pp. 274, 318-319.

[7] Harivaṃśa, Viṣṇu P. 37th ch. (ch. 92 from the beginning), 26 -34 śl.

Now, from the said version of the हरिवंश, the following synchronisms (along with others) follow :—

(1) position numbers 50 and 47- in 'B' and 'G' dynasties. काशीराज दिवोदास and his son प्रतर्दन (२य) fought with भद्रसेन्य and his son दुर्मद (पाठभेदे दुर्दम) respectively.

Vāyu P.[8] says :—

"......भद्रसेन्यस्य पुत्राणां शतमुत्तमधन्विनाम् ॥६१॥ हत्वा निवेशयामास दिवोदासः नराधिपः।
भद्रसेन्यस्य राज्यं तु हृतं तेन बलीयसा ॥६२॥ भद्रसेन्यस्य पुत्रस्तु दुर्दमो नाम नामतः। दिवोदासेन बालेति घृणया सः विवर्जितः॥ ६३॥" Hence they are contemporaries.

(2) Position numbers 53, 49 (or 50) and 50 (or 51) in 'B' and 'F' dynasties. "कार्तवीर्य अर्जुन had a quarrel with जमदग्नि for the possession of the कामधेनु of the latter, killed him but was killed by जमदग्निपुत्र परशुराम"[9]

Thus, evidently they are contemporaries.

(3) Position numbers 58 or 59 and 60 and numbers 57 and 58 in 'C' and 'B' dynasties. बाहु or बाहुक and his son सगर fought with तालजङ्घ (२य) and his sons हैहय-गण (३य) etc. *Vāyu P.*[10] says :—

"हैहयैः तालजङ्घैश्च निरस्तो व्यसनी नृपः। ... आग्नेयमस्त्रम् लब्ध्वा तु भार्गवात् सगरो नृपः। जघान पृथिवीं गत्वा तालजंघान् सहैहयान् ॥१२४"

(4) Position numbers -135 and -139 in 'A' and 'D' dynasties.

"श्रीकृष्ण was the brother of सुभद्रा and the maternal uncle of Abhimanyu, whose father is अर्जुन."

From all these, it is concluded that as so many synchronisms are very clearly explained and adjusted, it may be said with some certainty that the यादववंश started with यदु, the son of हर्यश्व.

---

[8] Vā. P. आनन्द० Edn. ch. 92. śl. 61-63 ; exactly in the said tone or language says Hari V. I. 29. śl. 69-70 or Hari V. I. 32. 27—30; etc.

[9] See भागवतपुराण: Beng. tr. by P. Tarkaratna, IX, 15. śl. 16—41 See also Viṣṇu P.—orig. and tr. by P. T. IV. 11 etc., योगवासिष्ठ रामायण speaks of six (or seven) परशुरामs.

[10] Vā. P. ch. 88. śl. 122—125 ; see also भागवत (P. T.) IX. 8. 1—5 etc.

A	B	C	D	E	F	G
		१। विवस्वान्	१। सोम			
		२। मनु	२। बुध			
		३। इक्ष्वाकु (९)	३। पुरूरवा (९)			
		४। विकुक्षि	४। आयु			
		५। पुरंजय	५। नहुष			
	(१०)	६। ककुत्स्थ	६। ययाति (१०)			
		७। सुयोधन	[= देवयानी			
		....	७। यदु (१ म..)]			
		....	३५। वितथ			३५। वितथ
		३७। अनरण्य	३६। भूमन्यु			
	मधुदैत्य	३८। पृषदश्व	३७। सुहोत्र (२य)			(वा सुहोत्र)
	—					(& ३६। गय..)
	मधुमती	= ३९। हर्यश्व	३८। अजमीढ़——			३७। काश्य
——	४०। यदु (२ य)	४०– त्र्यरुण	.	३९। सिन्धुद्वीप		३८। काश्य
४१। क्रोष्टु	४१। सहस्रजित्	४५। वसुमना	.	४०। जह्नु		३९। गृत्समद (३य)
	४२। शनजित्	= + ? सुधन्वा	.	४१? सुजह्नु		४०। दीर्घतमा (२ य)
		त्रिबन्धन	.	४१। पुरु		४१। धन्वन्तरि
	४३। हैहय (२य)	त्रिधन्वा	.	४२। अजक		४२। केतुमान्
	४४। धर्म	त्र्यरुण	.	४३। बलाकाश्व		४३। भीमसेन
	४५। धर्मनेत्र	४६–सत्यव्रत-म.	.	४४। कुशिक		४४। रिपुंजय
	४६। कुन्ति	४९। सत्यरथ-म.	.	४५। कुशाम्बा		४५। हेमरथ
	४७। संजित्	विष्णुवृद्ध		४६। गाधि		४६? अष्टारथ
	४८। महिष्मान्	+ ? = त्रिशंकु वेधा	४६। दिवोदास	४७। विश्वामित्र (७)		४६। दिवोदास

	४९। भद्रसेन्य	५०। हरिश्चन्द्र (७)	४९। सुदास	(अगिनीपति अचीक)		४७। प्रतर्दन (२य) (१)
	५०। दुर्मद। (१)	५१। रोहिताश्व (८)	५०।—अजमीढ़२य-म.	.		
	५१। अन्धक	५२। हरिताश्व	सहदेव (८)	.	४८। जमदग्नि	....
	५२। कृतवीर्य	५३–चंचु	सोमक	.	४९। परशुराम	
	५३। ..अर्जुन (२)	५४। चम्ब	ऋक्थ	.	—o— (२)	—o—
	५४? शशविन्दु	५५। सुदेव	संवरण	.		
	५५। जयध्वज	५६। भवक !	५५। कुरु (१ म)	.		
	५६। अहि	५७। वृक	(महा. आदि. ९४-९५ अ० द्रष्टव्य)	(द्रष्टव्य सा० आ०)		
	५७। तालजङ्घ	५८। बाहु–क		.	(द्र०जै०ब्रा०, शत० ब्रा०)	
	५८। हैहयगण (३)	५९। बाहुक–क	५६। अवीक्षित	.		
	(३ य) (&भरत ५म)	६०। सगर (३)	५७। परिक्षित	.	(५) ५६। शौनक इंद्रोत;	& तुर कावषेय (५)
		....	५८। जनमेजय (५)		....	....
		६४। भगीरथ (६)	. . .	(६) ५९। कहोल— (६०। अष्टावक्र)	समकालिक 'सोमशुष्म सात्ययजित्''	६२। कौरस्य —o—
-१३७५।	श्रीकृष्ण (४)		(४) १३९ अभिमन्यु		—o—	—o—

THE RISE, GROWTH AND DECAY OF CIVILISATION IN INDIA.

By SRI S. RAMAYYA

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

I feel highly honoured in being requested to deliver the annual address this year to your learned Institute. Founded in memory of the great Sanskrit scholar, Mahāmahopādhyāya Dr. Sir Ganganatha Jha, one of the famous Vice-Chancellors of the Allahabad University, this Institute is being run by eminent Indologists and learned professors of the Allahabad University. It has been doing very useful work especially in the matter of collecting and publishing rare ancient manuscripts. It has also published some very valuable research work by scholars of repute. As usual with such Institutes, its financial position is not as satisfactory as it should be. It requires funds for expanding its buildings, for opening other departments and for engaging more research scholars. I have been informed that at present there is only one research scholar, Sri A. S. Nataraja Iyer, who has done very good work on "*The Mīmāṃsā Jurisprudence and Rules of Interpretation of Hindu Law.*" Some of his researches are still awaiting publication for lack of funds. Indology is a vast field and we have yet to do enormous amount of work for years in it. As in British Institutions, we have to get hold of good scholars and assure them of a secure and satisfactory tenure so that care-free they may devote themselves throughout their life to their task of research. After Independence, our Governments, both in the States and the Centre, are very sympathetic towards such Institutions. It should not, therefore, be difficult for the organisers to stabilise them satisfactorily on the financial side.

Annual address delivered on February 17, 1957.

For to-day's subject, I have taken up '*The rise, growth and decay of Civilisations in India*'. I cannot claim to be a scholar in Indology. Indian History and its allied subjects have however always attracted me from the College days and I have done a little work on some aspects. In the presence of eminent scholars and savants assembled here, I am nothing. It is only my enthusiasm and love for the subject which have made me talk today in your presence.

1. The Rise, Growth and Decay of Combined Societies

Man was emerging probably a million years ago. From a sub-human level he was rising into primitive human level some two or three hundred thousand years back. Civilised humanity is of entirely recent origin when six or seven thousand years ago, three communities for the first time in history, in the Nile, the Euphrates Tigris, and the Indus valleys, respectively, show signs of civilisation. Since then various civilized communities in various parts of the world have appeared and disappeared.

The study of the origin, growth and break-up of civilized societies is a very fascinating subject. This is History proper. In his epoch-making ten volumes of "*Study of History*" Arnold Toynbee has revolutionised our ideas on the subject. He has looked at the problem from every angle and given a lead to new thinking on the whole question.

According to Toynbee the three fluvial civilisations, namely, those in the Nile, Euphrates and the Indus valleys (there is a little doubt about the origin of the last) rose by themselves straight from primitive life about six thousand years back. The rest of the civilised societies that have appeared till now on earth (Toynbee counts twenty-one of them) barring the two in America, the Mexican and the

Andean civilisations which also rose independently, have been born out of the older civilisations. They are apparented or affiliated to them.

How the three original civilisations arose cannot be explained easily. They probably emerged as a response to a challenge in a specially difficult situation which stimulated primitive man to an unprecedented effort. Before the dawn of civilisation, Sahara, Arabia and the uplands of Iran appear to have been a well-watered grassland. Slowly the cyclonic belts and storms shifted further north. Prolonged and progressive desiccation set in these areas. The primitive hunters who had a comparatively happy time were faced with a challenge. Some stood the ground and changed their habits thus evolving the nomadic manner of life. Others shifted south following the retreating grassland to the tropics and have preserved even today their primitive life in Central Africa. The rest entered the marshes and jungles of the Nile delta and facing the challenge it presented set to work to drain it and evolved the Egyptaic civilisation. Under analogous condition the civilisation of Sumer arose in the Tigris Euphrates delta. More or less a similar challenge must have produced the Indus civilisation and the later Sinic civilisation. Much later, independently, the challange of the tropical forests and bleak plateau produced the famous Mayan and Peruvian civilisations in Central and South America.

Not all civilisations are fully born; some become abortive and some after birth do not grow and attain maturity. Among the latter can be reckoned the Polynesian, Nomadic and Esquimo cultures. Most civilisations however after birth tend to grow. Growth occurs when response to a particular challenge is not only successful in itself but provokes a further challenge which again meets with a successful response. This is a repetitive, recurrent, rhythmic movement with challenge and response which

is potentially infinite. For example, in the Hellenic civilisation agriculture led to an urban civilisation. An urban civilisation led to over-population and a Malthusian challenge. The latter was met by colonisation and specialised export and import; and so on till a challenge is not met successfully; and growth stops. A growing civilisation is recognised by other signs also. There is a small minority of leaders of thought and action who solve all the problems facing the group. The vast majority of the average people have implicit faith in them and obey and follow them with enthusiasm. This is the internal proletariat. Around the earlier civilisations there is an outer ring of barbarism. The growing civilisation radiates on them politically, culturally and economically. They are slowly coming within its pale. The barbarian has also a tremendous amount of admiration for this civilisation and its leaders during growth. This is the external proletariat. In the growing phase there is complete social harmony between the leaders, the internal proletariat and the external proletariat. There is no schism in society. Similarly among the various states into which a civilisation articulates itself there is harmony and very little of internecine warfare. There is no reason why a civilisation should not grow indefinitely, each challenge being met by a successful response. This has not happened however in the past. At some stage, a break-up starts when a challenge is not successfully met. An unsuccessfully met challange has a habit of presenting itself repeatedly till either it is solved or it breaks the civilisation. Partial response usually only postpones the evil day. It is due to the failure of the minority of leaders who vegetate after their early successes, lose their creativity and would not make way for others. At this stage the internal and external proletariat break away from them losing their admiration for them. The old creative leaders become a dominant minority. A breaking society can

be recognised by social rift, and internecine warfare on a bitter scale. If the dominant minority has still some ability left they produce an universal empire, one state knocking down the others and creating a temporary peace. The external proletariat is restive and try to invade this empire at every opportunity. Some outsanding leaders may arise to save the situation for a while. The civilisation thus drags on with bouts of anarchy and peace or rout and rally till the last stage of disintegration comes.

At this stage, the minority completely fails and there are desperate civil wars and complete alienation of the internal masses. The civilisation plunges the sword into itself; it is a case of suicide. Just then the barbarian external proletariat breaks in and gives the *coup de grace* to the dying suicide.

The barbarian war bands and the alienated internal proletariat after a period of chaos and disintegration in which most of the barbarian war bands perish slowly give rise to a new civilisation of the affiliated variety.

This book picture is taken from the study of the great classical civilisation of Greece and Rome and the birth of the modern European civilisation. The same pattern can be traced in all civilisations though the book picture need not occur in exact detail. In later days the areas of civilisation increase and complete disintegration is not possible. Sometimes instead of barbarian war bands another civilisation may swallow alive a broken one as in the case of the Mexican and Andean civilisations. This is a case of murder and not suicide. In some cases as in India both barbarians and another civilisation may give the *coup de grace* (as will be explained later). If the area is too big and the barbarian war bands too small it may not be possible to break up a dying civilisation completely. A mauled and crushed society may continue to

survive after the barbarian inundations. There are various possibilities and they have happened.

In the modern world there are no barbarians to break up a civilised Society. All civilisations like the Islamic, Chinese, Hindu, European, tend to become one due to conquest of time and distance and their intense mutual influence of one another. They are tending to become members of one big civilised society.

Civilisation is an attempt by the human species to ascend a higher stage, from sub-human, primitive states to super-human levels. It should go on indefinitely and there is no limit. Civilisation is comparatively very young compared to human life itself and there is a big prospect in future. Humanity is only on the threshold of Time.

In this adventure the civilisations born in the Indian peninsula have played their own part which are not unimportant compared to other civilisations. It behoves every Indian citizen to study them in all their varieties, successes and failures. Let us start with Harappa and Mohanjo Daro.

2. Harappa and Mohanjo Daro Civilisation

Geology tells us that aeons back the land structure of the world was entirely different. There appears to have been a vast continent in the southern hemisphere; Gondwana or whatever the name, connecting Africa, India and up to Australia. The northern hemisphere was full of waters of the oceans. There was no north India or the Himalayas. In the pleistocene age, barely a crore of years back, vast changes occurred. The continent between Africa and South India sank under the ocean. Similarly changes happened east of India. Vast movements of earth crust and terrific volcanic activity threw up north India and the Himalayan and other ranges in Burma and Central Asia and Afghanistan. A terrific eruption of lava covered

the whole of the Deccan. Then the Indian continent slowly took shape. The Aravallis and the Vindhyas became a degraded system. The shallow seas of Rajaputana receded. Himalayan river system slowly arose, filled the shallow seas and formed the great plains. And new life started. Millions of years back India must have been a vast jungle, moist with heavy rains. Life slowly evolved. Ice ages came and went and reached the Himalayan slopes and even further south. River systems became steady. The coast line became fixed. Mountains took permanent shape except in the North Eastern Volcanic belt. Indian continent with its peculiar climate, fauna and flora became an entity. The overall geographical features produced a physical and social unity. Whoever came and settled in India came under the influence of these general features and in course of time became an Indian.

Primitive peoples must have squatted all over India, especially in the jungle clearings and uplands. They passed through Palaeolithic and Neolithic cultures. Some were dark and some were brown. Whether a brown race poured through the North-west we do not know.

About 4000 B. C. we suddenly find signs of civilised communities flourishing in the Indus valley, as revealed by the excavations at Harappa and Mohanjo Daro. How this civilisation arose it is difficult to say. It might have reached from Sumer and Egypt; or it might have been produced by the same causes independently. Future research may throw greater light on the subject. The best explanation appears to be that of Toynbee, namely, in response to the physical challenge of desiccation the hunting communities of the riverine valleys plunged desperately into agriculture by bunding and other irrigational operations and got started into civilisation. Once the start was there, the three civilisations of Sumer, Egypt and the Indus valley began influencing each other and

reacting on neighbouring barbarisms. From the ruins at Harappa and Mohanjo Daro one can deduce it was a fine bronze civilisation with strong urban centres drawing on the surplus of the surrounding agricultural wealth with comparatively fine amenities like baths, excellent streets and houses, a drainage system and sculputre and other fine arts. It was literate with a peculiar writing still undeciphered. The temple and the priest were probably dominant features as in the other two civilisations. It must have had a long period of origin, growth and slow break-up since all evidence points to nearly 2000 years of its existence. Naturally it must have been affecting the primitive societies in the Gangetic valley, mid-India and far south. Whether it formed part of the Empire of Sumer and Akkad in the third millenium is doubtful.

There seems to be little doubt that the Aryan nomads from the Central Asian steppes burst on this civilisation and almost completely destroyed it. This might be put between 1750 and 1500 B. C. What forces operated to produce this great outburst cannot be determined. A period of great aridity might have set in the steppes and driven out the nomads on the neighbouring sedentary civilisations; the vacuum created by the break-up of the Empire of Sumer and Akkad might have drawn out the barbarians in search of plunder. The Aryan waves apparently penetrated up to Europe in the west; through Persia up to Egypt in south-west and into India in the northern plains. Probably Harappa and Mohanjo Daro underwent long periods of civil war, got exhausted which helped the barbarian incursions who came and gave the last death blow to a dying civilisation.

This barbarian penetration must have been over a period of two or three centuries and in considerable numbers with women, herds, flocks, wagons, chariots and horses. The barbarian irruption completely wiped out

the older Indus civilisation; but the inhabitants must have offered very stout resistance as the Vedic literature testifies. In large areas the older inhabitants must have been massacred especially in the Punjab and Sind; in other areas they would have been driven into the hills, forests and inaccessible areas as in Rajaputana, Central India and the Himalayas. Probably the earlier waves of Aryans mixed with the local inhabitants; but later this process apparently stopped. The older civilisation could not have been completely destroyed. Large numbers of the old civilisation must have survived and their culture would have penetrated and influenced the invaders. This is a subject on which we have very little evidence. Later Śiva worship, some old Upaniṣads and various other features of later Aryan civilisation like house patterns, bead making, pottery, etc., seem to have survived from Harappa days.

3. The origin and growth of Aryan Civilisation in North India

After the destruction and early wandering, the Aryan bands start settlements in the Indus and Gangetic valleys. Like the contemporary Greeks they work up a magnificent civilisation. The causes are the same. The long trek and wandering from Central Asia produce a ferment in the barbarian mind. The wars and victories, bloodshed, heroic poetry, drink and feasts, stories of the bards, stir the imagination of such a people in a way unthinkable to us. The sombre spectre of the dead civilisation of Mohan-jo Daro through which they have ridden their gory way acts as a further spur. The new and vast country, its huge rivers, forests, fertile plains, add additional pep. Good food, loot, women add to the ferment. All these start the barbarian Aryan war bands on to a magnificent effort towards a splendid civilisation from about 1500 B. C. the like of which the world has seen only occasionally.

The growth of this civilisation is best understood and explained in the Toynbee concept of challenge and response. For our authorities we have to rely on the existing literature, the Vedas, Purāṇas, Smṛtis and the traditions preserved in the *Mahābhārata* and *Rāmāyaṇa*. Much of the literature was changed later but we can trace a core of old things in them. The Aryans were not literate in the strict sense, in the earlier days. They learnt every thing by ear and preserved it similarly. Consequently we have no inscription or coins or similar testimonies. We can however construct a fairly correct picture from some of the myths and traditions preserved in literature.

When the tribes after smashing the Punjab and Sind civilisations burst into the Gangetic basin their main problem was one of settlement. The Aryans could not have been very large in numbers. A large portion of the older inhabitants in Sind and Punjab would have been massacred leaving a big vacuum. Further east, there would have been only a thin layer of original people on the land. There was no population problem for the Aryans. Their main work was to fell the forests and settle comfortably, and spread round whenever numbers increased even a little. This challenge of the forest they met successfully with the shaft hole axes and physical vigour. Slowly they made permanent settlments through the whole of the north up to the Vindhyan and Central India forests, massacring or subduing the older inhabitants. This was the essential successful foundation of the Aryan civilisation. The older primitive inhabitants of Gangetic valley had not the vigour and strength to do this work apparently.

Contemporaneously they had a big social problem which they met also successfully. What to do with the older conquered inhabitants? There were two categories of them. The Harappa people would have been a highly civilised, probably brownish people with a substratum of

dark people. The main Gangetic people would have been of the darkish primitive type with a little Mongolian mixture in the Himalayan hills and in the east. The earlier civilisations solved such problems by complete massacre and later by massacre-cum-enslavement. The Greeks and Romans never thought of anything beyond slavery. The Aryans probably did the same with the Punjab and Sind people. The top classes would have been massacred and the rest enslaved. Lots would have escaped to jungles. But ferocity slackens after a while and other methods are tried. It was here that the Aryan showed great originality. He made the older and aboriginal people semi-serfs, with a lower class status called the Śūdra, and slowly emancipated them to the level of a fourth caste. The more unabsorbable he called outcastes or Pañcamaḥ who were living outside the pale but were not completely excluded. Smṛtis indicate gradual amelioration of these classes. The allied problem of intermarriage also they solved successfully. We are not certain of facts. Probably the following things might have happened. The earlier warriors came alone and intermixed with the conquered women. The latter tribes probably came with their women and pushing the older people settled as a purer race in the Punjab areas. After the warrior bands passed on later settlers probably had an aversion to intermix. But then when numbers grow poor Āryans cannot get pure Aryan women and the tendency will be then to marry women of the country. Such cross-breedings would have to be provided socially. The purer Āryans would naturally get the higher ranks while the mixed would get intermediate ranks first of father or mother in between. These problems were solved in a progressive spirit and if later society had continued on these sympathetic lines it would have probably abolished caste in the north, which unfortunately did not happen. We cannot but admire the early Aryan leaders and their generous

way of dealing with a tremendous social problem while they were in contact with a dark race whom they naturally disliked and whom they could conquer easily and massacre if they wanted. Against the solution of similar problems by the Greeks and Romans with their slavery of even very fair and highly cultured peoples this is much in advance. This is one of the greatnesses of the old Aryan civilisation.

The way in which Aryan civilisation and the north radiated on the surrounding barbarisms and civilised peoples and brought them within their pale is another piece of magnificent work. After they spread up to Bihar, Malva and Gujrat their momentum was lost. They were becoming settled people in the north. Beyond in the south lay the Vindhyas and vast forests of the Daṇḍakāraṇya with a slowly germinating Dravidian civilisation in the far south. The people there, were the later Dravidians and earlier aborigines. Up to Mahārāṣṭra and Godāvarī and northern warrior bands might have penetrated, settled down and mixed. Far south they sent cultural or ordinary missionaries; Brāhmaṇas, later Jains and Buddhists and traders who brought northern ideas, culture and trade and both civilisations mixed beautifully into the later Dravidian civilisation. In Bengal and Bihar there was more physical Āryanisation and they developed into free frontier Āryan kingdoms.

The political development also kept pace with the other developments. Like all barbarians the host in arms was the main feature of the earlier tribal polities with the popular assemblies and the King or Rājanya as the Primus Inter Pares. Some tribes kept up the aristocractic republican institution for centuries, like the Licchavis. Others developed into kingdoms with advisory bodies composed of all people. The Kṣatriyas ruled. The Brāhmaṇas advised and controlled. There were however large and

growing classes of Vaiśyas, Śūdras and untouchables who were outnumbering the top Aryans. They had not much voice but their lot was generally speaking good and their character high. There was plenty of land and plenty of food and everybody was happy. This was the famous Rāma Rājya of the north which we might roughly place about 1200 B. C. The main secret was of course a low and growing population and a high ratio of land to man-power. The small kingdoms slowly fought each other in mild healthy internecine warfare and were consolidating themselves into bigger kingdoms. These latter also started fighting each other but not in a ferocious manner. Occasionally, a Samrāṭ arose and conquered others but ruled them in a semi-federal autonomous way putting an end to internecine wars. Two great dynasties the Sūrya-vaṁśa and Candra-vaṁśa distinguished themselves. A very high ideal code of kings and administrative duty was insisted and carried out to a large extent.

On the cultural and religious side the contribution of this civilisation was extraordinary. It was probably its speciality. In the earlier days primitive nature worship prevailed. Then came the elaborate sacrifices very bloody sometimes, undertaken by the Brāhmaṇa priests. Meanwhile the older religions of Harappa were secretly being blended into popular religions like Śaivaism and Bhāgavata cult. About 1000 B. C. a most miraculous discovery was made by the thinkers and philosophers. In those spacious Vedic days there were plenty of forests near river banks. In the clearings of forests and their glades retired kings and Brāhmaṇas used to go for doing Tapas. They suddenly lighted on the great discovery of Brahman and the relation between it and the Ātman, the Soul. This discovery the profoundest in the world was enshrined in the deathless Upaniṣads. This perhaps is the greatest world contribution of the Āryan civilisation.

We can picture before our mind some of the scenes of those grand days. The Kṣatriya princes going to Swayamvara and competing with each other for the hands of fair Princess in princely prowess; Yājñavalkya and Maitreyī engaged in deep converse on an early morning on the relationship of Soul and Parabrahma on their way to the river; when a courier from King Janaka's Court brings a message requesting them to attend a big meeting of philosophical discussion a few days later. Kings mighty in battle, and philosophers pass by. There is very little poverty. Everybody is happy. The cities are flowing with milk and honey. No wonder later ages looked with astonishment at this age and called it the Kṛta-Yuga. No wonder when things decayed and society broke and morality sank people wailed and said Kali had come in.

Such was the grand Aryan civilization of the North which lasted for a thousand years from about 1500 B. C. to 600 B. C.

4. The break-up of the Āryan civilisation of the north

The splendid Āryan civilisation shows premonitory signs of break-up as early as 1000 B. C. The Mahābhārata war can be approximately fixed about that date. If at all it indicates anything it shows a spirit of bitter internecine war and loss of character on a large scale.

From about 700 B. C. the other symptoms of a breaking civilisation gradually show themselves one by one.

India enjoyed a long period of immunity from nomadic invasions after the Āryan incursions. The Cimmerians and Scythians about 800 B. C. are heard only in South Russia and northern Greece. Till first century B. C. with the coming of the Kuśāṇs and Śakas there was no barbarian threat at all. However new types of threats were arising externally. The Persians had built a huge Empire in the Middle East by 500 B. C. under Darius and

other great Emperors and they were now in contact with the Greeks on the west and Indians on the east. The collision of civilisations had started. We find Persian penetration of the Indus valley from about 500 B. C. and their occupation there till 326 B. C. But for their defeat in Greece and later the Hellenic attack on them they would have probably tried to conquer India. The penetration of another civilisation is an indication of a breaking society.

Internally, the kingdoms grow bigger and bigger in the usual process of expansion; the old republics slowly disappear except in far-off frontiers and after a period of balance and mild internecine war the bigger kingdoms enter into a period of fierce internecine wars. Avanti, Kāśī, Kośala, Magadha go on fighting with each other. Slowly Magadha expands, absorbs its neighbours and finally gives out the knock-out blow to the rest. The reasons are obvious. Magadha is on the eastern frontier of the Aryan civilisation and can grow as big as she likes with no checks on its outer flank while the middle kingdoms have to observe a strict balance of power. It is naturally free from the shackles and inhibitions of the older kingdoms. The population also is mostly non-Āryan with top classes being probably of Āryan descent or culture but with lesser prejudices. Already the Nanda kings of low origin have put her on a career of conquest. Now, came the terrific invasion of Greeks under Alexander who carried fire and sword through the Punjab and before whom all the petty kingdoms in the province fell quickly. The stage was set for the Mauryan Imperialism so efficiently carried out by Cāṇakya and Candragupta Maurya, for that age. This Imperialism conquered a good deal of the South and the North-west up to the Hindukusha, chased back the Seleucid Greek invasion and ensured peace and prosperity for 200 years in the North. It had an efficient bureaucratic type of administration. An Imperialism means

that a society had broken up. That the Āryan civilisation of the North was breaking up is more clear.

A better evidence is the seceding proletariat which is already starting its popular religions in Jainism and various earlier cults but more specifically in Buddhism. Buddhism was a reaction against the meaningless formalities and sacrifices of the older Hinduism of the Brāhmaṇas. The bloody sacrifices disgusted the people and the formalism of rites produced apathy in the masses and hypocrisy in the priests. The vacuum in the hearts of the people had to be filled up. Upaniṣadic philosophy was too abstract and too intellectual and required a powerful imagination and reasoning power. A semi-Bhakti cult was craved by the people and Buddha provided it, to some extent. When Buddhism became popular then the Mauryan Emperors had to adopt it, even as the later Roman Emperors had to follow the popular religion of Christianity. This is another sign of a breaking society.

Mauryan Empire was the first effort of the dominant minority to save its power. After about 150 years this universal Empire naturally broke up under two stresses. Such a huge Empire reqires a disciplined, trained bureaucracy and a succession of capable Emperors. The first was difficult to supply in that age, the second in any age. These failures led to dynastic revolutions and rebellion of Governors. Meanwhile from the first century B. C. a series of invasions civilised, semi-civilised, semi-barbaric and barbaric from the Steppes and the adjoining countries started from the frontier. First came the Bactrian Greeks, then the Śaka nomads, then the Yuechi with the Parthians for some time. The Indus valley was broken up and it was reverting to semi-barbarism. The Gangetic valley held on for a long while due to the dynastic changes, a more vigorous dynasty usually the generals replacing an effete line. The southern kingdoms and empires like the

Kalingas and the Andhra Empire usually propped up the tottering Gangetic Empires during times of troubles and if necessary ruling them during periods of weakness. Universal Empire having once been started repeatedly Empires were tried in the Gangetic valley. In the language of Toynbee the Āryan civilisation with its Universal Empire and their break up and restoration was in its stages of rout and rally till the Gupta Empire of the 5th century shows the last rally. After a glorious 150 years the terrific Hun invasions of the 6th century shatters it in the final rout and the grand Āryan civilisation breaks up and the neo-Hindu civilisation starts.

This break-up however does not entirely follow the book picture taken from the break-up of the Roman Empire. Some of the invaders like the Bactrian Greeks were not barbarians. The barbarians proper like the Śakas, the Yuechi and the Huns though they wrought enormous havoc could not percolate the whole of the north in enough numbers as to completely submerge the older society. The Āryan society had spread so widely, the population of India was dense enough and the civilisation had enough vitality especially on the religious side that these barbarians could not destroy much except in the Punjab area and could not reach long. Finally, they either got destroyed or absorbed in the culture of the older civilisation. Moreover, the far south with its freshness was always there to come to the help of the north both culturally and materially. To this extent the Indian pattern differs from others. The post Hun Āryan society starts as a maimed, syncretic Hindu society without being completely reborn.

The facts of the break-up of the Āryan civilisation have been indicated briefly. There is the fierce internecine warfare, the secession of the proletariat, new popular religions, foreign invasions both barbaric and other

civilisations, universal empires with rout and rallies and finally a new civilisation and order by 7th century.

All these show that the leaders of the Āryan civilised society failed to solve their pressing problems on various planes. It was not a single problem in which they failed. They could not solve the political problem of warring states with any federal idea. They could not also permit bitter internecine wars. Imperialism was consequently there with all its other consequences. Priestly classes failed the people and a new popular religion came in. There must have been general disgust with leaders and people did not mind foreign invaders. Even kings sometimes helped and invited them witness, for example, Ambhi of Taxila inviting and helping Alexander. More than all the social problems of India was an insistent one. If all had been Aryans with not much of caste there would have been no problem. There was always a big base of non-Āryan people. They got recruited by the poorer Āryans. The top pure society was small say a 10% Kṣatriya or a 10% Brāhmaṇa, while 80% were Śūdras and Vaiśyas. These people were growing in wealth and importance and education. They would naturally clamour for equality. As we saw the old Āryan policy was one of slow elevation of these classes. Apparently this process was reversed and a tendency to suppress them came in. In later editions of the *Manu Saṁhitā* Śūdras are despised. The intermediate classes take lower and lower ranks. No wonder the lower classes went over to Buddhism which preached a casteless society. This is probably the biggest factor in the break-up of this grand civilisation.

There is one fact in this decay. Aryan society was built on such good foundations and its leaders were still so capable that it tried to persist for a long while and save itself. It has shown for example greater vitality than

the later Rajput Hindu society of the north which had to get Muslim foreign rule to preserve its order. Aryan society fought for centuries against foreign invasions and never tolerated them easily.

5. Origin and growth of Neo-Hindu Civilisation

Everybody knows that modern Hinduism is entirely different from the old Āryan culture. The great Āryan age started with the Vedas and ended with the barbarian invasions and the popular religion of Buddhism. After the 6th century A. D. a new Hindu revival with its temples, Purāṇas, innumerable sub-castes and the modern Indo-Āryan vernaculars take shape and Buddhism slowly disappears. The line of demarcation may be kept at the Hun invasions when most of the old things are destroyed and the new starts taking shape. Definitely it is the birth of a new civilisation which we shall call as Neo-Hinduism. We have now to trace its origin and growth.

In a previous section we have already described the destruction of the Āryan civilisation of the north by the barbarians and explained how these raids did not proceed far enough to give birth to an altogether new civilisation as in Western Europe. The barbarians must have completely destroyed all culture and political life in Afghanistan, the Indus valley and in the Upper Gaṅgā valley. The remnants of the Empire in the far East and the more vigorous Southern Empires resisted them very strongly. The thrust of the barbarian was also less vigorous in these areas and at best the old culture received a maiming and not destruction. Even in the Indus valley the barbarians were soon captivated by the popular religions like Buddhism and Śaivaism. Mihiragula the dreaded Hun chief himself became a Śaivaite.

The much more difficult thing to explain is the slow abandonment by the masses of the popular religion of

Buddhism in the 7th and 8th centuries A. D. Buddhism arose as a protest against the excessive ritualism of the Vedic cults and the abstraction of the Upaniṣads. It became the popular religion of the dissident internal proletariat of the breaking Āryan civilisation. It was correctly capturing the new barbarians and strictly speaking it should have been the religion of the new age in the north and should have acted as the connecting link between the two civilisations as Christianity did between the Roman Empire and the new civilisation of the Mediaeval ages in Western Europe, playing a noble part through the dark ages. Buddhism on the contrary was attacked on all hands and disappears quickly. Kumārila Bhaṭṭa slashed it and revived the Pūrva-Mīmāṁsā Vedic religion and its sacrifices. Śaṅkara from far south rushed to the north and with his magnificent dialectical skill shattered its metaphysical basis. There was a great revival of Śaivism and Jainism and they in turn assailed Buddhism. There was probably great degeneration of the monks and the nuns and the people got fed up. The Rājās gave it up and took pride in reviving of the old Varṇa-Āśrama-Dharma. This strange archaistic revival in the north is something inexplicable. Even if Buddhism was given up as a twelve hundred years old decadent religion why this pretended imitation of the so-called Ārya-Dharma? Probably the leaders thought and vaguely remembered that the Āryan civilisation endured for a thousand years and the new religion with its Ahiṁsā and other features brought on decadence and foreign invasions and that reversion to the old Dharma would improve the Hindu civilisation.

And what a travesty they made of it without understanding the secrets of social growth. The first defect of the new culture was the looking back, what Toynbee would call archaism. An archaistic revival or ordering of society without understanding past history correctly and

without knowing that no society could be thrown back from the stream of progress is the surest and quickest way to ruin. And the architects of New-Hinduism surely and fully laid the foundation of a new culture and civilisation which would not last even 300 or 400 years and almost brought the third Indian civilisation to rack and ruin in the catastrophic Muslim invasions.

Society was ordered on what was called Varṇa-Āśrama-Dharma basis with the four castes and kings were enjoined to uphold the caste system. And the rulers of this period did take great pride in establishing the so-called old Dharma by importing Brāhmaṇas from Kanauj into Bengal and Bihar and other places where the castes got mixed during the Buddhistic regime. The Smṛtis were re-written to back up this system. The older liberal rules of marriage and other customs were cut out and societies were made rigorous and water-tight forbidding inter-marriage and inter-dining. In result with the new linguistic territorialism and functionalism caste became not four but four thousand with extreme bitterness and quarrels, an aweful monstrous system. A Vedic Ṛṣi fully believing in Catur-Varṇa of the old days would have been horrified at the caste system of U. P. in the tenth century A. D. A few fighting castes of Rājaputānā and the neighbouring provinces got elevated in this process as Kṣatriyas, latter called Rajputs; and fighting and ruling were confined to them in the north and west with disastrous results. For the people a syncretic Hinduism based on the popular Gods, like Śiva, Sūrya and Viṣṇu with huge temples were provided. Pilgrimages to sacred places, Śrāddha and other ceremonies were strictly enjoined. Most of these were based on imitation of Buddhism in an attempt to catch the people. Śaivaism in the north was selective and esoteric and popular Vaiṣṇavaism was to come only in the Muslim days. Purāṇas were written about places of

pilgrimage and older ones re-edited with greater myths. This inferior popular religion degraded both the people and the priest. The priest became an ignorant Paṇḍā and the people sank into meaningless worship and utter superstitions. There was a definite set-back for the common man on this mental food. Temples grew large on gifts and donations and elaborate Pūjās. The people would have revolted against this lifeless ritualism very soon but for the Muslim conquest when the temple was destroyed and real Bhakti movement came to the north.

The political ideas of this society were also backward. Some meaningless old-world institutions, like Swayamvara and Aśwamedha sacrifice were revived to improve the Kṣatriya spirit. The idea of a Cakravartī or an Emperor is old in India. He is of course only a *Primus Inter Pares* who conquers other kings in mild battle or by personal prowess but not disturbing the old dynasties. The Mauryan and other Empires of the previous period in the north were different based on a strong bureaucracy and destruction of the old dynasties. There was in this age a reversion to the older ideas. Kanauj became the centre of the north and he who ruled there was the Cakravartī or Emperor of India. He had to defeat others in battle based on Codes and Śāstras. Whenever he wanted of course all the other Kings should come and help him in battle against the foreign enemies. The kingdoms which were fairly big in north India except in Rājaputānā had mild and weak despotisms with a light bureaucracy and semi-feudal institutions. All republics and popular institutions had disappeared. The lower classes, the Śūdras and the Vaiśyas, had no place in the governance which was confined only to the Bhāṭs and the Rājputs or other ruling clans. These fighting castes naturally had to be provided with land for subsistence. They spread over

the land in something like Jagirs on the basis of rendering fighting service. One can understand the weakness of such a military system. The King's revenue being strictly limited to $\frac{1}{6}$ of land produce with very few other taxes and most of the land being given to ruling classes on feudal basis or to the temples he had very little revenue for a standing or professional army or a big and learned court. The semi-feudal levy naturally was useless against the professional Muslim armies in spite of their courage. In spite of internecine fights the art of warfare decayed in the north and degenerated into the old world champion fights which was probably to the liking of the archaistic leaders. It reminded them of the fight between Arjuna and Karṇa. The King had only a few palace guards apart from the levy. There was a weak hereditary inefficient bureaucracy to carry on law and order based on districts and sub-divisions unless it was merged in places with the feudal Rajput fighting classes.

Economically the generality of people seem to have been happy. They were lightly taxed and did not bother about fighting and ruling but were fully absorbed in their temples and pilgrimages and fasts and mostly became indifferent to politics; but certain advanced sections were beconing bitter as evidenced in Chack Nama describing society in Sind.

Very inferior type of Sanskrit literature, imitative, second-rate, erotic, was being produced by the learned of the ruling classes. Petty fighting, governance and eroticism seem to be the main occupation of the leaders. The vernaculars, Hindī, Bengāli, Gujarātī, etc., were taking shape foreshadowing the modern provincial split up.

These general ideas will make us understand the political efflorescence of the north. The small kingdoms into which Harṣa's Empire broke up, by internal friction

and fight became large country powers and sometimes were small Empires expanding whenever there was a vigorous rule by a strong dynasty. All had an eye on Kanauj, if not to rule, at least to put up its nominee as the Emperor. Under the Karkoṭas, Kashmīra expanded on all sides even up to Mid-India; similarly Sind. Only the Punjab due to long foreign rule was unable to assert itself and was ruled either by Kashmīra or Sind or by the Kabul Shahis of the later Lalluja dynasty. Rājaputānā due to certain peculiar features broke into small units although some of its enterprising clans carved big kingdoms outside, like the Gurjara Pratihāras. Gujarāt, Mālwā, Bundelkhand and Central India became similarly big powers under Solankis, Paramāras, Cedis and Haihayas respectively. Bengal and Bihar in the east, the stronghold of Buddhism, under the Pāla and the Sena dynasties, revived Hinduism and fought with the central powers for controlling Kanauj. Kanauj fell first in the hands of Gurjara Pratihāras and later the Ghahadwalas. Unfortunately in this universal fighting nobody emerged powerful enough to give a knock-out blow and start an universal empire.

It was at the beginning of this new age that a premonition of what was to come and a sure warning was given in the Arab conquest of Sind in 712 A. D. It was a novel and terrific conquest with massacre and slavery of men, forcible conversion and destruction of temples. Arab momentum was weak and their feeble attempts to expand were repulsed by the young Hindu civilisation. But the Hindu rulers were powerless to uproot it or realise the danger and the warning. They did not understand either the significance of lots people in Sind joining the invader especially the castes which felt oppressed; or why large portions of population were unable to fight or refused to fight.

6. THE BREAK-UP OF THE NEO-HINDU CIVILISATION OF THE NORTH

We have to analyse in slightly greater detail why the Neo-Hindu civilisation failed within three or four hundred years. The answer in general is that three important inter-connected challenges dogged this civilisation from its very start. On their successful solution depended its further growth. The Rājput and the Bhāṭa as the leaders of this civilisation utterly failed to realise the significance of these challenges and provide a response for them. These challenges repeated themselves and finding no solution, a tremendous catastrophe overwhelmed the Neo-Hindu civilisation within 400 years, in the shape of the Muslim conquest.

The first was the terrific social problem. Northern society after the mild caste system of the early Āryan days had passed through a thousand years of Buddhism whose main plank on the social side was the abolition of caste. Although it did not succeed fully in this, the higher castes in the great days of Buddhism got depressed and the lower castes like the Vaiśyas and the Śūdras got elevated and tasted power and equality. To depress such a society back into a water-tight hierarchical caste system meant terrific social suppression and great social rift. Buddhists and ex-Buddhists were considered everywhere low. Certain castes were forbidden certain social amenities. Jāṭs in Sind could not wear swords, or ride in palanquins; Vaiśyas and Śūdras could not be admitted in army or administration; in fact they should not bear arms. Prohibition of inter-dining and inter-caste marriages prevented unity and sense of social solidarity. The results were alarming. Apart from frequent social conflicts, solidarity of society was lost and a certain apathy took possession of the masses. In a province like Sind the Buddhists both due to bitterness and lack of training in

fighting seemed to have welcomed the Arab invaders. There are indications that even in U. P. the lower castes without realising the significance of the Muslim invasions welcomed the invaders. The Muslim historians say that the Rais and people came with presents to meet the invader. The Rājput and his adviser the Bhāṭa never realised the significance of this breaking off of the masses or were indifferent to it. The frontier people were openly abandoning Hinduism, joining Islam and becoming national enemies.

The second was a much more serious danger, very plain and very open, showed itself in two warnings at a wide period of time and finally overwhelmed this society. This was the threat of an invasion by the neighbouring Islamic civilisation. Nobody could mistake this threat and its magnitude. Islam was a fierce, iconoclastic, proselytising religion and had already spread quickly from Spain to Central Asia. Ancient peoples like the Persians and the Egyptians were converted by force to the new religion in no time. Islam never hid its purpose of assailing by force other civilisations and converting them to her way of thinking and living. It formed huge Empires, had enormous resources and had the support of the fierce fighting steppe nomads like the Arabs, Turks and the hillmen of Mid-Asia. The horrors of such invasions were first revealed by the Arabs in Sind in 712 A.D. when temples were destroyed and people were massacred mercilessly. Though the Arab did not push further inland with adequate resources, did the Rājput think by his petty victories over small Arab bands that he had solved the problem? Why was he keeping quiet without applying his mind from 800 to 1000 A.D. when the peril was becoming greater? Did he expect that Islam will vanish in a mist in course of time while before his eyes things were taking a different shape? Even to the meanest Rājput intelligence in this period it would

have been obvious that his man-power, resources and method of warfare were contemptible compared to those of the Arabs. The Arab engineering and siege craft were much better. His horses were of a superior quality, enormous in numbers and his tactical methods unbeatable. The horses bred in India were inferior not only in quality but they were very few in numbers. All foreign imports were slowly being stopped since the Arab merchants had captured the sea trade of the western seas and they were interested in supplying only a few inferior breeds to the Hindu powers at abnormal cost. While the slow break-up of the Muslim power in Baghdad and the stoppage of attack from Sind might have given the Rājput a little respite to his horror he saw another powerful kingdom being built in his Hindu Afghan mountains by another fierce nomad race, the Turk from Central Asia, then new converts to Islam, with all the ardour of the neophyte. The Afghan and frontier Hindus were openly going over to the new religion and becoming deadly enemies of India. If the Rājput had any doubt of his military inferiority in the previous period, the invasion of Ghazni and his invincibility in battle must have set it at rest once for all.

Did the great Bhoja, the Paramāra king of Mālwā, considered to be the greatest king of his age, reflect like this after the Ghaznide invasions were over? "In battle after battle the Turushka routed the Rājputs and the Punjabis. The reasons were clear. His horseman had superior Turkish mounts and were far larger in numbers. The Rājput had very few horses and they were very inferior. Though the Rājput was equally bold and courageous and ready to lay down his life he was more of an individual fighter and less a cavalry man. The mounted archers of the enemy slowly surrounded our armies, avoided the rush of the elephants, wounded them, drove them back on our infantry and in the evening with two or three well-directed

shock charges scattered our armies. We had neither the archers nor the cavalry to match them. They almost enveloped our forces and sometimes even attacked from rear. Every year they brought more and more men. Their country apparently produced innumerable fighters. In our country there are barely 2 or 3 lakhs of Rājputs and they don't produce more than 20, or 30 thousand fighters in a generation. If they are killed quickly where are the men to replace them. The Smṛtis say only Kṣatriyas should fight. If all the kingdoms lay aside their quarrel and combine, they start a fight about the command of the armies and do not co-operate in the field. Even against this army the Turushka can bring an equal if not a bigger army. His resources are inexhaustible. Moreover, the Turk assembles and marches quickly. It takes along time to assemble our Sardars and they don't march quickly and they grumble about a long campaign. The Turushka movements are not only quick but even our own people don't tell us or give any information about it. They are so indifferent. On the other hand, they give supplies to the Turk."

Bhoja, the Paramāra, was the most intellectual Rājput king of the 11th century. He was well versed in the sixty-four arts and had the best Paṇḍits and poets in his court. He or one of his successors wrote the whole of Sanskrit Grammar in the body of a serpent-like figure in a temple at Dhār. If Bhoja thought as above what was his solution? Even if they were capable of thinking of a solution, the society and the leaders were incapable of executing them.

There were only two ways of meeting the deadly challenge. By 1000 A.D. the Punjab, Afghanistan, Sind and the Frontier had definitely passed away from the Hindu hands. A powerful Empire, the Ghaznavide, with the fervour of Islam had established itself in the Afghan valley and they controlled East Persia and further north up to the Oxus. The area they commanded must have been over

five hundred thousand square miles. The steppes beyond and Iran provided them with horses and men apart from those in their own area, every one of whom was a soldier. To match this vast empire the whole of the Gangetic valley and Rajputana must have united and thrown all their resources and men under a unified Empire and command. The area was just equal to the Ghazni Empire and though the total number of men were larger only a certain percentage could fight. Half of it, Bihar and Bengal, due to Buddhism and Ahimsā could not supply men to fight. At least more common men could be armed and sent in masses to the field although they were not Kṣatriyas and the Smṛtis ordained against it. During the Hun invasions, the Guptas made most of the people fight. In other words, enormous numbers should be put in the field and the whole country must be roused with a cry of religion in danger which was true. The invader had a deadly military superiority in his horses and the Hindus could be cut to pieces in any open field. Rousing the country, denying supply to the invader, dragging him inland and starving him, a guerilla warfare, these were the only remedies open to the Hindus. Frontier fortresses along the East Punjab frontier might have been useful. This depended upon a strong universal Empire and a loyal population both of which are usually contradictions. At least, an Universal Empire would have had better resources and a stronger army and better leaders. This the Rājput was unable to supply. His internecine warfare produced a feeble federate Empire which made the position worse with the subordinate Rājās quarrelling and rebelling, as they were not removed after a conquest. The pooling of resources was impossible in such a loose Empire. Actually no State became powerful enough to knock out the rest and start an Empire. The result was that bitter internal wars continued, the resources got frittered away and the small fighting population got

decimated. This was the failure of the Rājput, the inability to produce a strong centralised Empire against the threat of deadly invasions.

The aweful fact was that in this civilisation the creative minority was made of such poor stuff that they solved no problems, very soon became a miserable dominant minority who could not even create a decent universal State; but went on quarrelling among themselves bitterly. The only alternative was a foreign invader who would ruthlessly create an universal Empire and keep peace in the land.

In the latter period from 1000 to 1200 A.D. the same problems and challenges repeated themselves with frequent raids of the weak Ghaznavides in Mid-India. Viśaladeva the Chauhan and his nephew Prithvīrāja were the best leaders that this race could produce in this age. Viśaladeva seems to have had some petty victories over the small raiding Turkish bands in the Gangetic valley. He prides himself on this and shows some sense of the problem in his Delhi inscription where he enjoins his successor to drive out all Mlechchas beyond the Frontier. Prithvīrāja his successor would have been an excellent champion fighter in an earlier age. He showed very little vision or political sagacity but successfully alienated every neighbouring country by his wars, lost most of his Sardars in abducting a princess, won a solitary victory due to inferior generalship of Ghori and finally lost the independence of India at the battle of Terrain in 1192, a fate which that society could not avoid or prevent.

The latter history of the civilisation in the north is briefly told. According to Toynbee based on the analysis of the history of previous civilisations, a society or civilisation which is breaking up produces an universal state. If the internal leadership is poor foreigners step in and give it its universal empire. In the growth, decay

and further reorganisation of these empires we can trace a rhythm of three and a half beats, of rout, rally, rout, rally, rout, rally and a final rout when the civilisation disintegrates, perishes and there is a new birth or palingenesia. We have already passed the three and a half beats both in the north and the south. For the north, the time of troubles started during the Muslim invasions, then the rally was the early Sultanate; then occurred the break-up of 15th and 16th centuries followed by the Mughal peace; the third rout was the eighteenth century anarchy, with the rally of the British peace, and their quitting. Deccan similarly had three rallies in Rāṣṭrakūṭa Cālukyan, Bahamani and British Empires with routs in between. Similarly the far south had the Colā, Vijayanagar and British imperialisms with routs in between.

7. The Southern Picture

The picture south of Vindhyas is entirely different and requires a different explanation. India being a vast tract of land what applies to one part need not necessarily apply to another part, especially in the earlier centuries. This is true of the two big parts of the country, namely, the land south of the Vindhyas and the land to the north of it. In every respect, the age of the land, physiography, climate, the peoples, social institutions, political progress and evolution, the southern origins and growth start and proceed on different lines till at one stage both meet and fuse and then influence each other strongly and then follow more or less a similar course with probably a little time lag.

Geologically Deccan and the far south is very ancient land, being probably part of the old Gondwana land. It existed aeons before the Himalayas were thrown up, when most of north India was probably sea. As we saw a crore of years back probably vast changes took

place. The oceans swallowed the land between Africa and the Western Ghats. The Himalayas were thrown up and north India was formed. In the east also the continent sank and left only the Polynesian islands. Terrific volcanic eruptions and lava covered the land for millions of years. Its western and north-western parts are bordered by mountain chains round an upland area and this is the Deccan plateau proper. It has an excellent climate though somewhat arid towards the east. The fringes in the east and west, namely the coastal plains and the deltas must have been formed more recently by the river systems. In the third and second millenniam the whole area must have been a dense tropical forest whose clearance and settlement were the main activities conducing to civilisation. On three sides this land is surrounded by surf-ridden seas, with very few islands round about. It has plenty of rains with terrific monsoon storms. In the early ages these seas prevented invasions on a large scale but promoted commerce and trade to and from all surrounding civilisations which conduced to peaceful interpenetration of culture. There is a general maritime tincture in the south though it is not on such a large scale as in the Mediterranean littoral. The heavy monsoon rains and the smallish river systems are conducive of fertility and moderate prosperity. The river systems are easy of control and have led to bold experiments in irrigation, as for example the ancient anicut system of the Cauvery delta. The largest influence on this land is of course from the north where the Vindhya mountains don't act as a serious barrier. It follows that whatever influences the north must have its echoes will be heard in the south and will percolate down there later. If there had been a big sea between the north and the south or a high range of mountains like the Himālayas, South India would have had a different history.

Vice-versa the north also was influenced throughout ages by radiation of the south politically and culturally till both got standardised on a basic Indian culture.

The Neolithic age was slowly growing out of its barbarism into primitive culture by probably about 1500 B. C. in the south. Whether there was a separate inclusion of a brown people called Dravidians somewhat earlier is not certain. Before the time of Northern Āryan penetration there were probably two distinct sets of people—one imposed on the other. The older and primitive inhabitants were either driven into the mountains and inaccessible forest areas or were enslaved in the plains while a more civilised people were occupying the plains and river valleys. The latter may for convenience be called the Dravidians. The two people might have mixed to a large extent in various parts. By 1000 B. C. they evolved a simple tribal or totemistic society to which were added small layers on the top mostly people migrating from the north either as warriors or religious teachers and cultural missionaries. The earlier Āryans war bands must have penetrated Mahārāṣṭra and in thin streams probably came up to the Godāvarī and the Kṛṣṇā while Brāhmaṇas and Buddhists spread over the whole land in every age. Except occasionally there was in historical days very little of violent and ferocious interruptions as in the north by barbarian bands or conquerors. Consequently, the southern society pursued leisurely its own even tenor and slow evolution and developed more along its own lines and genius. Though northern institutions were largely imitated, in actual practice the people were less caste-ridden and less influenced by priests. The social structure took the form of a small hereditary priestly class on the top with a few ruling families who rose and fell and who were rarely considered as high born Kṣatriyas with a large middle population

of peasantry and a small depressed class at the end. In such a society the combination of the Brāhmaṇa and the Kṣatriya of the earlier days of the north or the latter day Bhāṭa and Rājput to ride down the others was impossible. The southern Brāhmaṇa was very small in numbers and the ruling families were ever changing and these could not interweave themselves to oppress others. The Brāhmaṇa had to develop a keener intelligence and a high character and this he had to keep up for long ages to wield the little influence he was capable of. The lower population on an average was less specialised, intelligent, philosophical and religious and artistic and so was capable of better manipulation when well led.

Consequently, evolution and political progress evolved peacefully and steadily without any serious or violent interference. It was essentially a conservative progress, slow and steady. When the north got stunned by the barbarian invasions and was breaking slowly, the steady south had to step in and help her materially and culturally. The Śaka invaders had to be fought and driven out of Mālwā by the Andhras. The same work had to be done later by Vijayanagar and Marathas against the Muslims. Śaṅkara had to give the death blow to Buddhism and renovate Hinduism. Rāmānuja inspired the Bhakti movement of the north in the dark days of the Muslim rule.

The southern peninsula actually contains two big sub-regions. A line drawn from Goa *via* Hyderabad to the mouth of the Godāvarī represents the northern frontier of the pure Dravidian regions. Below that line, there is a certain unity of language and culture. This region even now with its four allied Dravidian languages of Tamil, Telugu, Kannada and Malayalam, form a separate entity with a culture of its own. Its food, dress,

manners, music and art are allied and entirely different from the north. In certain historical ages as in the great Cola days, they had their political unity also. In the fringes, the population is a little mixed probably due to the migration of the earlier Āryan war bands. In Tamil country such a mixture is very little though in Malabar we notice greater mixture with Brāhmaṇas from the north and immigrants from the seas.

North of this, in the Deccan plateau proper, in Mahārāṣṭra in the west and Kaliṅga in the east the penetration of the Āryan civilisation both physically and culturally was more intense. These regions aligned themselves more with the North and always looked towards them. Actually they were the borders of early Āryan penetration and the Mauryan Empire came up to them and included them. When the Mauryan Empire decayed like typical vigorous frontier provinces these tracts showed great vigour and activity. The Kharavela Empire of Kaliṅga actually expanded into Magadha. The great Andhra Empire from the second century B. C. to second century A. D. similarly, not only interfered in the north, but played a great part against the Śaka invaders and tried to carry on the great imperial tradition from Deccan. Its own huge size and difficulties of expansion into north prevented its developing into another Mauryan Empire. This region thus became a semi-Aryanised area midway between the far southern Dravidian block and the pure Āryan north, something like Magadha, blending into itself the best of the north and south.

It is not now possible to trace exactly when this region was emerging into civilisation from barbarism. There must have been contacts between Harappa and the far south if not by land at least by sea coastwise. Kolar gold is found in Harappa ruins. We cannot however locate any civilisation in the south by 3000 B. C.

The dense jungles and the primitive nature of its inhabitants were inhibiting factors. When Harappa and Mohanjo Daro were shattered did colonists from there run to the south and settle in helpful riverine deltas, and in Ceylon and start a civilisation? Did Rāvaṇa's ancestors come to Ceylon from Mohanjo Daro and keep the ancient heritage of hatred towards the northern Āryan when he tried to penetrate the Vindhyan jungles? These are speculations. All that we can say is that by 1000 B. C., the primitive communities of the far south were slowly developing themselves into civilised societies. Various factors might have been the cause. The challenge of the forests, the influence of Harappa, commercial intercourse with Egypt and Sumer, the echoes of the Āryan and Daśyu clash of the north and Harappa immigrants, etc. There is evidence that even in the third millennium the far south was having commercial intercourse with Mesopotamia and probably Egypt. By the time of the Āryan invasion of the north due to the influence of the neighbouring civilisations and their own efforts an independent civilisation must have been starting at least in the coastal and riverine sides of the far southern Tamil country and Ceylon. If we date the *Rāmāyaṇa* about 1250 B. C. and if it preserves some historical truths, the south then must be a dense jungle with civilised communities hither and thither, at Pampā in the Tungabhadrā area and Ceylon in the far south. Northern penetration especially by Ṛṣis and the priestly classes started by about 1000 B. C. when vigorous civilisation must have started. By 500 B. C. the three Tamil kingdoms must have been flourishing. In the third century B. C. Aśoka speaks of the three Tamil kingdoms of Cera, Cola and Pāṇḍya as his neighbours. The Greek navigators of early Christian era and early Tamil literature speak very highly of their civilisation. Scores of Buddhist and Jaina monks were

spreading their religion while Brāhmaṇas were carrying their Vedic Religion to the end of the Peninsula. By the first century A. D., the whole of India had forgotten the old clashes and had become culturally one though the southern Dravidian block definitely preserved its cultural entity with certain absorption of northern culture.

By this time the Āryan civilisation of the north was breaking up and politically it was entering into the stage of the Universal Empires. Naturally this idea travels down quickly south and they try to imitate it without the reason for it in the growing and unbroken southern society. The Deccan plateau being more Aryanised and having been included in their Empire naturally follow that pattern. The Dravidian block, a more vigorous society in its early growth stage, in pure imitation and probably in self defence tries to enter the Universal Empire stage more prematurely when small states would have been the normal state.

The characteristics of the southern civilisation and its nature can now be comprehended. It was more indigenous in origin and its roots were in primitive life. It was not an affiliated one but an original like that of Harappa. The peoples who started it were primitive and ancient peoples with very little of wandering or nomadic background. They were not very fair or very strong physically. They were even black and somewhat ugly. Their psychology was also different. They were more mystical and metaphysical. They were sombre and shadowy. There was not the gaiety and happiness of the Āryan life. There is something unworldly austere and weird about the Dravidian civilisation with its terrific Śaivaism going probably to primitive life. Its latter temples give one a queer feeling. Probably Harappa and Mohanjo Daro were like that. It has not got the grandeur and flash of the Āryan civilisation but shines

in the sky like a lone star apart. It has its compensations. It is more steady, more deep-rooted and in great emergencies it shows great strength and it is a moral support to the Āryan of the north. While the Āryan winces, goes down repeatedly and comes up, the Dravidian is steady and slow in his progress. He has not the brilliance of the Aryan but his sobriety is better.

In the 6th century after the Hun invasions while the northern culture was breaking and a new Neo-Hindu civilisation was springing the southern regions especially the Dravidian bloc was at the peak of its growth. Society was not vertically split up by a well-developed caste system though there were small numbers of classes like the Brāhmaṇas who were trying to introduce caste in the south. The masses were kept lively and exercised by the long series of Bhakti movements, first the Śaivaites and from 8th century the great Śrīrangam Vaiṣṇava movement. Temples were coming up and they were the real abodes of saintliness. A moving, emotional, religious and secular literature was springing in the Tamil land and entering into the daily lives of the masses. A thin Jainism and Buddhism and even a little Vedic sacrificial religion were leavening and giving variety to the religious experience of the people. Kings, nobles and masses were Śaivaite or Vaiṣṇava Bhaktas but tolerated the best in every religion. Sanskrit was cultivated at top level by the small number of Brāhmaṇas and Buddhists. The philosophical temper and atmosphere of the land produced in the 8th century the great genius Śaṅkara and later the other giants like Rāmānuja and Madhvācārya. At least in this period people of all classes lived tolerantly and after the overthrow of Buddhism and Jainism in the ninth century there was very little of religious schism and class conflict. The masses were economically prosperous and there was always a flouri-

shing foreign commerce. The political systems were simple national monarchies with a good bit of self-government. The internecine warfare for example between the early Colas, Pāṇḍyas and Ceras was mild. Horizontal schism had not set in. By contrast in the Deccan bloc the growth stage had ceased, caste was more strict and the religious conflicts between Buddhism, Jainism and Hinduism more fierce leading to an earlier social rift. The northern examples were always more infectious there and the universal state had set in very early from the days of the Andhra Empire. Once the idea of Empire starts it goes on except during periods of rout or disintegration. From the 6th century to the 12th century three vigorous dynasties, the early Cālukyas the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and the later Cālukyas ruled with a strong militarism, striking north and south violently. These universal empires with their periodical break up and recovery almost conform to the book picture of rout and rally and shows breaking society till they go down under the Muslims in 14th century.

In the Dravidian block Universal Empire is thrust rather prematurely and in a definitely growing stage when usually such phenomenon does not occur. Two reasons can be given for this. The incursion of the Pallavas, a semi-Āryanised people in the 4th century A. D., and their expansion in the Tamil land was an important factor. They were probably feudatories of the Andhras and after the break-up of that Empire they tried to introduce the Universal State in the far south. They succeeded to a large extent and built an Empire in the Dravidian areas from 7th to the 9th centuries. A Universal State became a necessity later on since the Deccan Empire like the Cālukyas and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas were always invading the south. Later the Pallavas became Tamilised. The great Colas from the latter half of the

tenth century carried on this tradition on a grand scale.

From 1000 till 1250 A. D. the Cola Empire was one of the remarkable institutions in Indian History. Since it was built in a growing society through imitation and for self-defence it released the tremendous energy of a growing people and achieved much more in every sphere than the usual Empires of a breaking society where the non-creative dominant minority can show some limited activity while the people become apathetic and sullen. The Cola Empire was different, and hence deserves more than a passing mention.

The polity was unique. It was based on a highly developed village self-government with adult franchise and enormous powers to the village assemblies—a system the like of which was not seen in the past anywhere, nor in the succeeding centuries including present-day India. The popular basis was strengthened by assemblies of people at higher levels and a light, mild, non-interfering bureaucracy in charge of law and order with a strong popular Royal Court at the top. The significance of this lies in the fact that in a semi-dark age which was going back to land and organising itself in feudal and semi-feudal institutions only in the far south of India a flexible non-feudal administrative system prevailed based on direct state relationship with the peasant and a good deal of popular self-government. These are unimaginable in a contemporary Rājput administration. The reason is not far to seek. It lies in the deep-rooted and innate aversion of the Dravidian genius to having any intermediary in land tenures, and in all matters pertaining to land. They hated all kinds of landed aristocracy and removed them quickly whenever such an institution showed itself. It is not a far-fetched idea that this was the basic strength of the Dravidian bloc which made them

successfully resist the later Muslim invasion. In addition, the maritime activity of the Tamils kept their minds free from fossilisation as in the north.

The military system was very strong based on a standing army. It consisted of a well-trained infantry and archers and a small cavalry entirely free from the feudal bias of the levies based on land tenure. If they had more horses the Colas would have overwhelmed probably the whole of India. Even with this slow army they were more than a match for the Cālukyas and had conquered up to Bengal. Their navy had swept the seas up to Sumātrā and Jāvā and Ceylon became part of their Empire. Trade and commerce flourished and brought in wealth and a semi-cash economy. Mathematics and engineering had so much advanced that they could control river valleys and deltas very successfully. The grand anicut in the Cauvery delta is a tribute to Cola engineering abilities and much in advance of those times. Temples and buildings, sculpture and painting, dance and drama and music, on a scale hitherto unknown and of a very high quality were blossoming forth. Learning both vernacular and Sanskrit was encouraged on a tremendous scale. Both Bhakti and philosophical movements were flourishing side by side and mass intelligence was on a high level. The south was at its height of glory but the Empire, the terrific wars with the Cālukyas, the great emotional stress of Bhakti and external activities were slowly exhausting the energies of the people especially of the Tamil land by the 12th century.

After the break-up of the Cola Empire both the Deccan and the far south passed through another Universal Empire, namely, Vijayanagar in the far south and the alien Muslim Bahamani Empire in the Deccan. Then comes the great effort of the Deccan people, namely, Marathas, to throw off the alien Muslim Universal

Empire in which though they were almost successful due to the resultant anarchy, another foreign Universal Empire, namely, the British, was set up. In this way both the south and the north joined together as one united civilisation, in the last Universal Empire of the Neo-Hindu Civilisation.

8. The Modern Civilisation of Independent India

After the departure of the British there should normally be a break-up anarchy and the birth of a new civilisation. In fact, it is a puzzle to many Europeans why it has not happened in India as in China, the far-East, Burma and many other countries.

The answer to this question is that the birth of a new civilisation in the modern world need not necessarily be through social and political anarchy. The reaction of the Indians to European civilisation was in this wise. Whatever might have been the tyranny and oppression of the individual Britisher, and however much they as a nation might have exploited her, the Indian got to like the finer aspects of the European civilisation, its democracy, science, industry, education, rationalism, free press and general freedom. His struggle was to attain all these and enjoy them; in other words, to become like another European nation. In the course of the long British rule, various aspects of the European culture were absorbed and the British were asked to quit so that India might realise her stature as a civilised nation fully. Civilised now means largely Europeanised. The fact is, the whole world is now slowly becoming one civilisation, one comity of nations, in which while there will be no objection to the older civilisation contributing their essence, the main things would come from the advanced West European civilisation. India having become a member of this comity of nations, there was no need

for Britain to stay. India has absorbed the European culture and is developing a new civilisation in a peaceful way and there is no need for her to go through a social break-up. In this transition, the remarkable personality of another superman which India produces periodically, namely, Mahatma Gandhi, with a new and original method of fighting an aggressor by non-violence and the galaxy of brilliant leaders whom he trained and who are now ruling India, played a great part.

India has been started to a new civilisation in a painless way and it is under the rule of its own leaders. All civilisations from the start have its problems and challenges and on the successful solution of them, depends their future growth for centuries. Since it is current politics, it is enough to mention these challenges of the New India. First comes her poverty problem, her huge masses of starving crores, their low standard of life and their utter poverty. On a slightly lesser level is the problem of consolidation of this vast mass of humanity, themselves in various stages of evolution, into a solid nation with fervour, patriotism, health, education and broad and robust outlook. Hindu social structure of innumerable castes has kept this society into water-tight compartments and at various levels of culture from most primitive to the most advanced. Foreign rule has exploited the situation, perpetuated and created bitter animosity between castes, which is called communalism in India. To create a new patriotism in this society and to keep it alive during this severe transitional period will tax the capacities of the leaders of New India. To coalesce and fuse this conjeries and bring the lower elements to the level of the higher elements in a casteless society with an excellent code of progressive law is also a challenge which will tax the keenest intelligence for decades. Allied to this there is a third problem of keep-

ing up this hard-won independence against external dangers during the period when New India is to be built. This is also a very powerful challenge to New India. That the new leaders are alive to these problems and are meeting it with resilience and capacity, unimagined anywhere, is an indicator of the great future that is in store for the new civilisation of India.

NĀṬYA-ŚĀSTRA of Bharata with the commentary of Abhinava Gupta, Chapters 1 to 7, vol. I, edited by M. Ramakrishna Kavi and K. S. Ramaswami Sastri, second edition pp. 64, 18 and 487. Price Rs. 20, 1956. Oriental Institute Baroda, vol. xxxvi of the Gaekwad's Oriental Series.

We congratulate the *Baroda Oriental Institute* for this second edition brought out with critical emendations of the text though after a lapse of 30 years after the publication of the first edition. The *Nāṭya-Śāstra* of Bharata was popular throughout India. *Inter alia* it attracted the Kashmirian Abhinava Gupta to write a commentary thereon; manuscripts of the text and commentary are found in Kerala State; and the dance pôstures illustrating Bharata are found carved in the Gopuram walls of the shrine of Lord Naṭarāja at Cidambaram. The large number of manuscripts available are not sufficient to make out even now a critical authoritative text; and many places are there which have been "*re-constructed*" by scholars for over 3 decades from Ramakrishna Kavi down to the second revising editor. Under the circumstances further efforts should be made by scholars for the acquisition of more Sanskrit manuscripts including this text and commentary. Our suggestion is based mainly on the text of Bharata which contains a definition of the traditional eight *Rasas* while the commentary has an elaborate discussion on *Śānta*—the ninth Rasa also and refers to disputed readings of Bharata's text which are not now found in the available manuscripts. Again, there is great uncertainty prevailing over the definition of the technical terms of the constituent parts of the ancient Indian theatre which Bharata describes in the second Adhyāya. Prof. Subba Rao, an Engineer in the Baroda University and a Sanskrit scholar, has given his reconstruction of the ancient

Indian theatre in an appendix of 36 pages, on the basis of his suggested definitions.

While praising the Baroda Institute for the excellent get-up, the reproduction of the 108 dance sculptures in the Cidambaram temple is far from satisfactory, especially in a technical treatise dealing with dance and its postures.

The learned editor M. Ramakrishna Kavi has by his indefatigable efforts succeeded in getting the other volumes of the *Nāṭya-Śāstra* with the commentary of Abhinava Gupta published in the Gaekwad series; but unfortunately, he died only a few weeks ago and could not fulfil his promise of adding his own commentary on the 7th & 8th Adhyāyas of this volume, as Abhinava Gupta's commentary is still missing in all the available manuscripts.

STUDIES IN INDIAN LITERARY HISTORY, vol. III by P. K. Gode, Curator, Bhandarkar Oriental Institute, Poona, Published by the P. K. Gode collected works Publication Committee, Poona, pp. x and 254. Price Rs. 20/-.

We have in this volume a collection of 28 articles on a variety of subjects dealing largely with accurate biographical details of the Sanskrit authors, their works with their dates which have now been fixed with great certainty by Dr. P. K. Gode, who needs no introduction. This volume has been published with the financial help of his friends who presented the volumes to him on the completion of his 60th year.

The articles in this volume would give ample and best material for writing a *History of Sanskrit Literature* by Indian scholars, with historical facts relating to their biography and correct dates.

We are indeed happy to learn that Prof. Vishva Bandhu Sastri has begun printing the fourth volume of Prof. Gode's collected papers and we hope to see the volume placed in the hands of scholars at an early date.

INDIAN PHILOSOPHICAL STUDIES, vol. I by Prof. M. Hiriyanna, Kavyalaya Publishers, Mysore, 1957, pages 154. Price Rs. 7.50.

The late Prof. Hiriyanna was the Professor of Sanskrit and Philosophy in the University of Mysore and he is well-known for his two works—*The Outlines of Indian Philosophy* and *Essentials of Indian Philosophy*. His *Essentials* has called forth recently a translation in Hindi.

After his death, his admirers have thought of bringing out his papers contributed to several Journals in the form of a book; and the present volume contains 19 of such essays of which 2 were contributed to this Journal in 1943 & 1945. A special feature is that the extra notes subsequently made by Hiriyanna to his several papers, evidently to their republication in a revised form, have also been now published.

Prof. Hiriyanna is famous for his two traits of clarity in presentation and faithfulness to the text. Many of the articles in this volume deal with the *Problem of Truth and Error* in the several branches of Indian Philosophy. It is our duty to point out that a standard work on this subject of the Problem of Truth and Error in English is a desideratum; and the present volume affords ample material for scholars working in that direction. We eagerly look forward to the second volume of Prof. Hiriyanna's Indian Philosophical Studies.

—A. S. Nataraja Ayyar

A SOURCE BOOK IN INDIAN PHILOSOPHY, edited by S. Radhakrishnan and Charles A. Moore, Princeton University Press, U. S. A. Price 5, pages xxix and 684.

We welcome this American publication of the source book in Indian Philosophy covering the entire period from the ancient Vedas to contemporary writings. The book contains translations of the relevant original passages and

thus, it fulfils a long-felt want of a handy book of original passages to be placed in the hands of the student who is often tempted to ignore the originals. Charles A. Moore is the Professor of Philosophy in the University of Hawaii and the editor of *Philosophy of East and West*. He stayed at the Banaras Hindu University and worked with Dr. Radhakrishnan on this project. The work is divided into 5 periods —The Vedic period, the Epic period, the heterodox systems, the orthodox systems and contemporary thought. The introduction to each period and the short history of Indian thought has been contributed by Dr. Radhakrishnan. The work certainly deserves to be confidently placed in the hands of students.

The Vedic period contains the translation of all relevant texts of the Saṁhitās and of the Upaniṣads. The Epic period contains extracts from the *Mahābhārata*, *Manusmṛti*, *Arthaśāstra* and the whole of the *Bhagawadgītā*. The section on heterodox systems refers to the Cārvāka, Jainism and Buddhism; and in this, the whole of the *Dhammaapada* is given. The section on the four schools—Sāṅkhya, Yoga, Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika is fairly full giving the whole of the *Yoga-sūtras* with the relevant extracts from the *Bhāṣya* of Vyāsa and the *Tattva-Vaiśāradī* of Vācaspati Miśra.

When we come to the Pūrva-Mīmāṁsā and the Vedānta of Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja and Madhwa, we have to state that the few extracts from the Sūtras, Vārtika, and the Bhāṣyas would prove unsatisfactory for the Indian as well as for the foreign students. Students should have a firm grasp of these systems which may be styled as living systems viz.—the Pūrva-Mīmāṁsā system and the Vedānta of Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja and Madhwa.

It may also be pointed out that authors of such critical books on Indian Philosophy should try to be more careful to present the thoughts in true Indian spirit. We welcome the volume as an addition to the literature.

TANTRA-RAHASYA. A Primer of Prabhākara Mīmāṁsā, edited by Shama Shastry and K. S. Ramaswami Sastri, second edition, Gaekwad's Oriental Series No. 24, 1956, pages lxxxiv, 7 and 83. Price Rs. 8/- with a Foreword by G. H. Bhatt, General Editor, Gaekwad's Oriental Series and Director, Oriental Institute, Baroda.

This second edition is a thoroughly revised edition with an elaborate introduction of 70 pages on the Prabhākara school of Mīmāṁsā from the erudite scholar of Mīmāṁsā Mr. K. S. Ramaswamy Sastri who was the Śrauta Paṇḍita of the Oriental Institute and is now the head of the collation section of Vālmīki's *Rāmāyaṇa* which is being edited by the Oriental Institute, Baroda.

Prof. G. H. Bhatt says in his foreword that the Prabhākara school of Mīmāṁsā has begun to receive its due treatment only since the publication of the D. Litt. thesis—Allahabad University in 1909—of Mm. Dr. Sir Ganganatha Jha on 'The *Prabhākara School of Mīmāṁsā*. The Prabhākara school has often been more misunderstood. His system deserves all praise, *Inter alia*, for his raising the Adhyayana-Vidhi into an Adhyāpana-Vidhi and thereby securing the preservation of the cultural heritage of India, and for his raising the supreme command of the Vidhi on a level higher than the categorical imperative of Kant in the West; and hence, deserves to be better known to the average student of Indian Philosophy. The present work meets the need in a remarkable way.

Prof. Bhatt concludes his Foreword with an appeal that the book may be prescribed as a text-book in our Universities. We have great pleasure in subscribing to that appeal—with this addition that the student should have a faithful translation of the text with notes, on the lines of Dr. Edgerton's edition of the *Āpadevī* and we would further add that the companion volume of the same author on the Bhāṭṭa system viz. *Nāyaka-Ratna* which is a commentary

on Pārthasārathi Miśra's *Nyāya-Ratna-Mālā* be similarly translated with notes. Then we shall have a book on the Prabhākara system and another on the Bhāṭṭa system—both by the same author Rāmānujāchariar who lived about the 16th century A.D.

Aumāpatam, edited by Sri K. Vasudeva Śāstrī, B. A., B. L., Published by the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras, pp. xix+76. Price 2-2-0, 1957.

The volume under review is a work on Music and Dance. It is based on the Śaivāgama. India has its own independent contribution to this Art from the time of Bharata. The South has preserved this Art more faithfully. The volume describes in detail the various aspects of Music and Dance in 38 chapters.

The Editor has given an elaborate introduction to the volume which easily introduces a beginner into the subtleties of the subject. But it is still very difficult to understand the correct implication of all the technical terms used in the texts, beginning with the *Nāṭyaśāstra* itself. There are many ancient texts on the subject available only in manuscripts which have not been published because of the above difficulty. However, it is very encouraging to find that scholars are busy to bring into light the obscure texts. We congratulate both the editor and the publisher for this interesting edition.

Vaiśeṣika–Darśana of Kaṇāda, edited with Introduction in English and Sanskrit by Professor Sri Anantalal Thakur, M. A., Mithila Research Institute, Darbhanga, Published under the auspices of the State Government, Bihar, pp. 26+102. Price Rs. 6·50, 1957.

Vaiśeṣika-darśana is one of the oldest systems of Indian Philosophy. It is believed that the great Rāvaṇa,

whom Vālmikī has described in his *Rāmāyaṇa* as a great Vedic scholar and Murāri Miśra I has introduced him as a commentator on the *Vaiśeṣika-Sūtras* in his *Anargharāghava*, wrote a *Bhāṣya* on it. Rāvaṇa's *Bhāṣya* is not available. Its references are found in literature. Later on, the only complete running commentary on the Sūtras is the *Upaskāra* by Śaṅkara Miśra. But prior to it there was a commentary, called *Vṛtti*, on it which has been profusely quoted by the *Upaskāra*. But the great interval between the Sūtras and the commentaries has created a great problem about the correct and complete version of the Sūtras. Even in the *Upaskāra*, doubts are felt regarding the correctness of the text.

It is a matter of great satisfaction that Prof. Anantalal Thakur has been able to secure an annoymous commentary on the Sūtras and has published the same with great accuracy and study. This commentary, as the editor points out, seems to belong to about the twelfth or thirteenth century A. D. It is indeed a very interesting commentary. It throws light on many obscure problems connected with the system itself. The commentary is often very brief, but very lucid and free from the influences of the style of the later neo-Nyāya literature. There are several Sūtras, the commentary on which agrees with the views of the author of the *Vṛtti* quoted by the *Upaskāra*.

I find that the Oriental Institute, Baroda has under preparation a commentary called—*Vaiśeṣika-Sūtra-ṭippaṇaka* by Candrānanda. Whether the commentary under review is in any way connected with Candrānanda's commentary, cannot be said at this stage. But it will be very helpful for the Oriental Institute to consult this commentary for its own publication. I congralulate the learned Editor of the commentary for his valuable introduction and hope he will continue his studies on the system and bring into light more important facts.

APPENDIX A

A forgotten chapter of the History of Ancient Indian Astronomy.

Addenda

Page	Line				
11	5	After	Section I	Add	(PP. 11–54)
,,	6	,,	Table I	,,	Page 14
,,	7	,,	,, II	,,	Page 16
,,	,,	,,	,, III	,,	Page 16
,,	8	,,	,, IV	,,	Page 18
,,	9	,,	,, V	,,	Page 19
,,	10	,,	VI	,,	Page 19
,,	13	,,	Table VII	,,	Page 33
,,	14	,,	Table VIII	,,	Page 34
,,	15	,,	,, IX	,,	Page 41
,,	16	,,	,, X	,,	Page 43
,,	17	,,	,, XI	,,	Page 52
,,	19	,,	Section 2	,,	(PP. 81—98)
,,	20	,,	Table XII	,,	Page 83
,,	21	,,	,, XIII	,,	Page 84
,,	22	,,	XIV	,,	Page 86
,,	,,	,,	Table XV	,,	Page 87
,,	23	,,	,, XVI	,,	Page 92
,,	25	,,	Section 3	,,	(PP. 98–117)
,,	29	,,	Table XVII	,,	Page 112
,,	32	,,	449 A.D.	,,	Pages 113—114
,,	33	,,	337 A.D.	,,	,, 114-115
,,	34	,,	1857–60 A.D.	,,	,, 115-116
,,	35	,,	Aśvinī	,,	Page 117
16	3	For Months in Cols. 2, 4 and 6 Read Nakṣatras			
,,	31	For Viakhas Read Viśākhā			
17	15	For माघाद्याश्वैवमेकादशा Read माघाद्याश्चैवमेकादशाः			
,,	23	Delete the number 2 after संयोगे			
18	21	For n Read In			
,,	27	,, ofI Read of			
19		In Table V Col. 2 For Phalguni Read Bhādrapada			

*Published in Vols. IX—XII

Page	Line	
19		In Table VI Col 4 For Jyeṣṭhā Read Jyeṣṭhā-Mūla
21	29	For अध Read अथ
25	10	For 49° 56′ Read 49″ 56
28	4	Begin the para with.—Assuming for the present the statement of Lāṭadeva that the star Punarvasu was exactly at the northern solstice in his time
,,	,,	For Let Read let
31	30	,, P.m. ,, P.M.
,,	32	a. m. ,, A.M.
36	19	,, under ,, ones and
38	5	delete half
,,	23	After useless add (B. S. S. Tantraparikṣādhyāya V. 2)
,,	27	For Varse Read verse
,,	28	For Svayabhū Read Svayambhū
39	13	For for his own time, 23° 38° Read 23° 38° for his own time
40	34	For SS 60 Read SS — 60
40	35	After values add (following Leverrior's Tables without correction)
42	28	For 9° Read 10°
,,	33	After planets add for 499 A.D.
43		In Table X Col. 3 For 39′ Read 13′
		,, ,, 4 ,, 4″ ,, 47″
46	10	For rstronomy Read astronomy
48	7	After Citrā add (चित्रा)
50	19	For शुनासोयन read शुनासीयेन
51	31	after longitude add (330°)
,,	32	delete which
,,	36	for From read On account of
52	5	for "mana" read "man"
52	15	after 3045 B.C. add as has been already pointed out. We propose here to adduce further proof.
		delete as we shall presently see.

Page	Line	
52	22	for with read and
53	12	for also read thus
,,	13	delete as well
,,	14	after Kali era add (3102 B.C.)
,,	19	after might add also
54	14	after This add also
81		in the last line for 19.7 read 19.1
90	12	for nakṣatra read star
,,	22	after point add that is, the end of the third quarter of Bharaṇī at or near the star Apabharaṇī, 35Arietas,
103	24	for 80 read 101
109	13	for resonable read reasonable
111	34	after table add gives tropical longitudes and dates at the beginning of different months in 1953 A.D., It
,,	36	after sun's add tropical
112	2	after equinox add of 1953 A.D.,
,,		in Table XVII Col. 2 after sun's add tropical for on read at

113 in Appendix I Col. 3

for	Kṛttikā	read	Bharaṇī
,,	Rohiṇī	,,	Kṛttikā
,,	Mṛgaśirā	,,	Rohiṇī
,,	Ārdrā	,,	Mṛgaśirā
,,	Punarvasu	,,	Ārdrā

below Ārdrā leaving one line add Punarvasu

Page	Line	
113	21	delete Puṣya
		for Āsleṣa Read Puṣya
		below Puṣya leaving one line add Āśleṣā
		in Col. 4 line 26 for 223° read 228°
114		in Appendix II Col. 3 line 3
		for 0°20′ read 3°20′

सतीर्थ्ये मृते त्वेकरात्राद्विशुद्धिस्सदा ब्रह्मचारित्वमाप्तस्य तस्य।
समानोदकानां पुनर्जन्मनीह त्रिरात्राद्विशुद्धिर्धृताऽत्र प्रबन्धे ॥१५॥
विशुध्यन्ति ये बान्धवास्ते त्र्यहेण तथा संस्कृतस्त्रीजनानां मृतानाम्।
यथोक्तप्रकारेण चान्ये यथोक्ताः सनाभ्यादयः शुद्धिमायान्ति लोके ॥१६॥
लवणरहितमन्नं वा तदक्षारयुक्तं त्र्यहमुदकविधानैर्भोजनीयं निमज्ज्य।
विधिवदपि न मांसस्याशनं तावदेषां
शयनमपि पृथक्त्वेनैव निर्दिष्टमस्ति ॥१७॥
दशाहान्तरे चेद्विदेशं गतस्य शृणोत्वन्तमेतद्दशाहान्तराले।
विशुद्ध्यत्युपात्तावशिष्टैर्दिनैस्तैस्त्रिभिर्वा दशाहाद्बहिर्विश्रुतस्तु ॥१८॥
मरणमपि सजातीयस्य वा पुत्रजन्म श्रवणपथगतं मासोर्द्ध्वसंवत्सरान्ते।
सपदि सरिदुपान्तं प्राप्य च स्नानमद्भि-
र्भवति शुचि सवासो जातमूर्द्धाभिषेकैः ॥१९॥
सपिण्डे तु सम्वत्सरान्ते व्यतीते श्रुते शुद्धिरुक्ताऽम्भसा मार्ज्जनेन।
विदेशान्तरस्थेऽसपिण्डेऽथ बाले गतेऽन्तं शुचिर्वाससाम्भःप्लुतेन ॥२०॥
श्रुतिस्त्वेतयोश्चेद्दशाहान्तराले विशुद्धोऽवशिष्टैर्दशाहान्तरस्थैः।
विधेया पुनश्चोदकादिक्रियात्र स्वदेशे यथायोगमन्यत्र कार्य्यम् ॥२१॥
समाप्तं यतो वेदवेदाङ्गवाक्यं तमाचार्यमाकर्ण्य सम्प्रस्थितम्।
त्र्यहाच्छुद्धिमाप्नोति तत्पुत्रजाया गतौ वागतश्चेद्दिवारात्रमात्रम् ॥२२॥
गते वेदविद्यागमज्ञानयुक्ते समीपोपदेशोपचारक्रियासु।
त्र्यहादाश्रमी शुद्धिमाप्नोत्यभिज्ञो यती वा मनः स्मायतः शुद्धिमेति ॥२३॥
समाप्ते तथा मातुले पक्षिणी रात्रिरुक्ता विशुद्धौ महीपालकस्य।
स्थितो यस्य राज्ये मृतौ तस्य विप्रोऽशुचिर्ज्योतिषाऽन्यस्त्वहोरात्रमध्ये ॥२४॥
दशाहेन शुद्धिर्द्विजानामिहोक्ता तथा द्वादशाहैरियं क्षत्रियाणाम्।
दशाहैस्तु पञ्चाधिकैर्वैश्यजानाम् विशुध्यन्ति शूद्रास्तथा मासपूर्तौ ॥२५॥
न कुर्य्यात्तथा कर्म्म चापद्विशुद्धस्सनाभ्योऽपि देवार्चनादिक्रमेण।
प्रवृत्तो भवेदप्रवृत्तौ तु तस्य क्रियानादृताप्यन्यलोकैरसाध्या ॥२६॥
रजस्वलां सूतकसंयुतां स्त्रियं ब्रह्मघ्नगोघ्नस्वपचादिकञ्च।
स्पृष्ट्वा शिरःस्नानतया विशुद्धस्त्यक्तावरोऽन्याम्बरतामुपेत्य ॥२७॥
कुष्ठ्यादीनां स्पर्शने तद्वदेव स्नानं वासोभिस्समं शुद्धिहेतु।
तत्सम्भाषादावुपस्पृस्य शुद्धः प्राणायामी गात्रसम्मार्जनेन ॥२८॥

नवीनं नरस्नेहयुक्तं नरास्थिस्पृशेच्छुद्ध्यति स्नानमात्रेण विप्रः।
तथान्येऽश्वान्प्राङ्‌शं विप्र एव स्पृशेच्छुद्ध्यति स्वद्भिरर्क्कक्षणेन ॥२९॥
तथा ब्रह्मचारिव्रते संस्थितानां सपिण्डे मृते नोदकं नापि शुद्धिः।
परन्तु प्रयाणे स्वपित्रोरनेनापि कार्य्या क्रिया चोदकादि क्रमेण ॥३०॥
सगोत्रे मृते तु व्रतान्ते विधेया स्वपित्रोर्मृतौ कर्म कृत्वा व्रताप्तिः।
त्र्यहाच्छुद्धिरुक्ता व्रतान्ते तु तेषां व्रतालोपने तावदेव व्रतित्वम् ॥३१॥
विधर्माश्च ये त्यागिनः स्त्रीजनानां वृथा ये परिव्रज्य याताः सगोत्राः।
तथैवोपकृष्टात्मनस्त्यागिनां नो विशुद्धिस्तथैवोदकादिक्रियापि ॥३२॥
वृथा मुण्डिपाखण्डिनां गोत्रजानां तथा मद्यपस्वैरिणीनां हतानाम्।
स्वभर्तृद्रुहागर्भसंघातिनीनां न दाहोदकादिक्रिया नो विशुद्धिः ॥३३॥
सदाचार्य्यमध्यापकं मातृपित्र्यग्निदातॄन् गुरून् वा विनिर्हृत्य नैव।
व्रतालोपनं ब्रह्मचारित्वमस्य स्वयं वर्द्धते किन्तु तावद्दिनेभ्यः ॥३४॥
शूद्रं प्रेतं दक्षिणामुखेन ग्रामाद्राज्ञा दाहकैर्योजनीयः।
विप्रा वैश्या क्षत्रियानुत्तमाश्च सर्वाशाभ्यो दक्षिणाशां विहाय ॥३५॥
राज्ञां दोषो नैव च ब्रह्मचारिन्यासिब्रह्मध्यानयज्ञस्थितानाम्।
सत्रादौ वा सद्व्रते यज्ञदीक्षाकर्मण्येषां सद्यःशौचक्रियास्ति ॥३६॥
विद्युत्पातै राजशून्याहवे च ये वा राज्ञा वा हताः कर्मदोषात्।
विप्राद्यर्थं वा मृतानां विधेयं सद्यःशौचं पार्थिवाज्ञाश्रितानाम् ॥३७॥
सोमाग्न्यर्काणां यमेन्द्रानिलानाम् मात्रा निर्हृत्यैव वित्तायतिभ्याम्।
राजा जातो लोकपालात्मकोऽसौ तस्मादेतद्भावनेनैव शुद्धिः ॥३८॥
उद्यच्छस्त्रैर्ये हतास्संमुखस्थाः संग्रामे स्वर्गप्रभावे मृतानाम्।
तेषां सद्यःशुद्धिरायाति यज्ञात् ज्ञातो लोके क्षत्रियाणां विशेषात् ॥३९॥
विप्रः शुद्धोऽद्भिर्भवत्यूर्द्ध्वक्त्ये शस्त्रादिस्पर्शेन च क्षत्रियोऽपि।
वैश्यो रश्मीन् वा प्रतोदादिकं च स्पृष्ट्वा कृत्वा कर्म शूद्रोपि यष्टिम् ॥४०॥
एतच्छौचं नैमिषारण्यदेशीयेभ्यो विप्रेभ्यो द्विजाग्नेभ्य उक्तम्।
सापिण्ड्ये सत्येव चाद्या सपिण्डाशौचं युष्मभ्यं यथैव ब्रवीमि ॥४१॥
विप्रो निर्हृत्यासपिण्डान्परेतान् मातुर्वंश्यान्वा विशुद्धस्त्र्यहेण।
शुद्ध्यत्येतद्बन्धुभिश्चेद्दशाहैरन्नं भुंक्ते प्रेतिनो यद्विधस्य ॥४२॥
यो वा साहित्येन पात्रस्य नान्नं भुंक्ते गत्वानाश्रमे वासमेति।
एकेनैवान्हा विशुद्ध्यत्यभिज्ञः स्नात्वा मूर्द्धावाहकान्न स्पृशेच्च ॥४३॥

न सर्वैः प्रेताः शूद्रसंस्पर्शदूष्या दाहादौ चान्यैर्न मार्गोपनेयाः ।
नैवा स्वर्ग्या याहुतिः शूद्रसंगसंस्पृष्ट्वा वा याहुतान्यैरयोग्यैः ॥४४॥
यस्माज्ज्ञानं सतपोऽग्निस्तथान्नम्(शु?)द्धा चेतो वारिवोपार्जनञ्च (?) ।
वायुः कर्माण्यर्ककालावशुद्धौ चैते संशुद्ध्यर्थमुक्ताविशेषात् ॥४५॥
ये वा शुद्धा द्रव्यशुद्धास्त एव शुद्धाः प्रोक्ता वारिमृद्भ्यान्न शुद्धिः ।
प्रायश्चित्तं ये न कुर्वन्त्यशुद्धाः पापं कृत्वा दानमादाय चापि ॥४६॥
क्षान्तो विद्वान्सो विशुद्ध्यन्ति दानैर्दुष्टात्मानः पापकर्माभिसक्ताः ।
ये वा प्रच्छन्ना बृहत्पातकेन तेषां शुद्धिस्तादृशान्तर्जपेन ॥४७॥
मृत्तोयाभ्यामेव शुद्ध्यत्यशुद्धो वे‌ान्नद्यः स्त्रीरजोभिर्विदुष्टा ।
अद्भिर्गात्राण्यन्तरात्मेह सत्यात्संतापेनैवं मनः शुद्धिमेति ॥४८॥
बुद्धिर्ज्ञानेनैव चात्मोदयेन स्वात्मा विद्यासंतपोभिः स्वकर्म ।
स्वाचारेण ज्ञानहीनोपि विप्रः शुद्ध्यत्यात्मन्यासकर्मोपचारैः ॥४९॥
एषा प्रोक्ता वः शरीरे विशुद्धिर्द्रव्याशुद्धिः श्रूयतां श्रौतकार्य्ये ।
अद्भिः सौवर्णं तथा राजतं वा माणिक्यं वा शुद्धिमाप्नोत्यसक्तम् ॥५०॥
सक्तं चैतं तैरशुद्धैरथाश्मपात्रं शुद्ध्यत्यंभसा भस्मनाद्भिः ।
अग्नौ प्रक्षिप्याद्भिरामृज्य हैमस्योक्ता शुद्धिश्चात्यशुद्धस्य लोके ॥५१॥
ताम्रायःकांस्यत्रपूणां विशुद्धिः शीसस्येत्थं पित्तलस्यापि कार्य्या ।
क्षाराम्लाभ्यां मृत्तिकाभिर्विशोध्य शुद्धांभोभिर्न्यायतो न्यासपूर्वम् ॥५२॥
शुद्धिः सर्वेषां द्रवाणां रसानामुत्प्लावोग्निसर्सर्पिषः केवलस्य ।
दार्वादीनां प्रेक्षणं संहतानां खट्वादीनां दण्डसन्ताड़नेन ॥५३॥
पात्राणां यज्ञे स्थितानां विशुद्धिर्वाद्भिः सम्मार्ज्योच्यते चामसानाम् ।
देवानां वा शुद्धवारिप्रचारैः प्रक्षाल्यैवोक्ता मया मंत्रवर्ज्या ॥५४॥
धान्यानां च प्रोक्षणाच्छुद्धिरस्ति प्रायो वस्त्राणामपि क्षालनेन ।
चर्माशुद्धिः स्पृश्यजन्तोर्जलेन प्रक्षाल्यैवं वै दलानां विशुद्धिः ॥५५॥
वन्यानां पुष्पेतराणां फलानां शुद्धिस्तद्वत्कन्दमूलादिकानाम् ।
ग्राम्याणां ग्राम्यसम्पर्कजानां कन्दानामेवाग्निसंशुद्धिरस्ति ॥५६॥
कौशेयानां चाविकानां विशुद्धिः प्रोक्तेहोषैः(?) कौतुपानामरिष्टैः ।
विल्वैः प्रोक्तेहांशुपट्टादिकानाम् क्षौमाणां श्वेतैरियं सर्षपैश्च ॥५७॥
शंखादीनामस्थिजानां विशुद्धिर्गोमूत्रेणैवोदकेनोपरिष्टात् ।
काष्ठानां संप्रोक्ष्य चेत्थं तणानाम् शुद्धिः प्रोक्ता वेश्मनो मार्जनेन ॥५८॥

यथा मद्यैर्मूत्रैः शोणितैर्वा पुरीषैः पूयैर्यच्च ष्ठीवनैः पात्रमक्तम्।
अग्नौ पाकेनापि नैतस्य शुद्धिर्बुद्धिभ्रष्टस्वैव जातोर्बलेन ।।५९।।
भूमिः शुद्धा जायते मार्जनेन गोमूत्रैर्वा गोमयैर्लेपनेन।
गोनां (?) वासेनापि चोल्लेखनेन गाङ्गैर्वाद्भिर्भूरिशः सेचनेन ।।६०।।
भक्ष्यैर्जग्धं पक्षिभिर्वा गवाभिर्घ्रातं पादोल्लंघितं केशकीटैः।
युक्तं सिद्धान्नं तथा वारि पेयं मृत्प्रक्षेपेणैव शुद्धि प्रयाति ।।६१।।
लेपैर्यावद्भिर्भवेद्गंधशुद्धिर्मृत्तोयानां सर्वद्रव्यक्रियासु।
तावद्भिस्तेषां तथैवाशु शुद्धिः कार्य्या विद्वद्भिः सदाचारयुक्तैः ।।६२।।
यच्चादृष्टाशुद्धिर्निर्णिक्तमद्भिर्वाचा यद्विप्रैः प्रशस्तीकृतं स्यात्।
देवाः प्रीता ब्राह्मणेभ्यो व्यवस्थां चक्रुः पूर्वोक्तत्रयं शुद्धिमेति ।।६३।।
आपः शुद्धा भूमिसंस्थाविशेषाद्वैतृष्णं शुद्धाभिराभिर्भवेद्गोः।
चेदस्पृष्टाः पापिभिर्वा सुवर्णाः सौगंधाढ्यास्सद्रसास्ते भवेयुः ।।६४।।
कारुःस्पृष्टं शुद्धमेवास्ति नित्यं यच्चाशुद्धः स्पृश्यते पण्यमध्ये।
स्त्रीणामास्यं ब्रह्मचर्ये च भैक्ष्यं मेध्यं पक्षिप्रापितं यत्फलं तु ।।६५।।
शुद्धं गोघ्रातं पयस्तन्यदेशे वन्यानामाखेटने श्वा शुचिस्तु।
क्रव्याद्भिर्वान्यैर्हतानां पशूनां मांसं शुद्धं पक्षिणां प्रोक्षणेन ।।६६।।
नाभेरूर्द्ध्वं यन्मुखाक्ष्यादि सर्वं स्पृष्ट्वा लोको नात्यशुद्धिं प्रयाति।
यद्यच्चाधो रंध्रवद्वा नखादि स्पृष्ट्वा कर्मादौ विशुद्धोद्भिरेव ।।६७।।
गौरश्वच्छाया तथा विप्रुषश्च चन्द्रज्योत्स्नामक्षिकार्कप्रभावः।
भूर्वाय्वग्नी भूरजो भौतिकेऽस्मिन् देहे स्पृष्टाः शुद्धियुक्ता भवन्ति ।।६८।।
मज्जा शुक्रं मूत्रमश्रूर्ध्वजा च विट्श्लेष्मासृक्कर्णनासामलानि।
स्वेदो दुष्टाश्चेद्रसा द्वादशैते शोध्या वाद्भिश्शोधनीयौषधैश्च ।।६९।।
विण्मूत्रोत्सर्गे मृदाशुद्धिरेका लिङ्गेति स्रस्तागुदाशोधनेपि।
वामे पाणौ शोधनीये दशाद्भिः शुद्धिः प्रोक्ता सप्तभिर्दक्षिणे तु ।।७०।।
विण्मूत्रोत्सर्गादिशौचान्त एव खान्यद्भिः स्पृष्ट्वा विशुद्धिं प्रयाति।
भुक्त्वाचम्यैव त्रिधा शुद्धिमेति भूयो विप्रो द्विः पुनर्मार्ज्जनेन ।।७१।।
स्त्रीशूद्रावाचम्य चैकाद्भिरेव शुद्धौ दन्तान्तर्गतं शुद्धमेव।
श्मश्रूण्यास्ये संगतान्यङ्गदेशे शुद्धान्येवं सङ्गतान्यङ्गजानि ।।७२।।
शौचे द्वैगुण्यं गृहस्थाद्व्रतित्वे तत्त्रैगुण्यं स्याद्वनस्थायिनां च।
चातुर्गुण्यं तेभ्य एवं यतीनां शूद्राणामुच्छिष्टभोक्तृत्वमस्ति ।।७३।।

सेवा शुद्धिर्ब्राह्मणानां तथैवोच्छिष्टं शूद्राणामथो मुण्डनञ्च ।
मासे मासेऽहर्निशं विन्दवस्तु विप्रोच्छिष्टाः सेवकांस्तान् पुनन्ति ॥७४॥
स्पृष्टश्चोच्छिष्टेन च द्रव्यहस्तो भूमावस्थाप्यैतदाचम्य शुद्धः ।
द्रव्यैस्सार्द्धं तानि चोच्छिष्टहस्तस्पृष्टानि स्युश्शोधनीयानि नान्यैः ॥७५॥
वान्तो रिक्तो वा घृतप्राशनेन शुद्धस्स्नात्वा जायते मैथुनेपि ।
सुप्त्वा भुक्त्वा वानृतं वाचमुक्त्वा क्षुत्वा निष्ठीव्याचमेत्कर्म्मसंस्थः ॥७६॥
स्नात्वा क्षौरान्ते विशुद्धिं प्रयाति मृद्भिर्गात्राणि प्रलिप्याशु तानि ।
मूर्द्धश्मश्र्वादीनि चेत्थं नखानामद्भिः शुद्धिः प्रोच्यते कर्तनेपि ॥७७॥
एतच्छौचाचारकर्मप्रचारिप्रष्टव्येषूक्तं मयार्थेषु भूयः ।
श्रद्धा युक्तेभ्यो भवद्भ्योऽर्थधर्म्मकामार्थिभ्यः कीर्तयिष्येऽन्यदग्रे ॥७८॥

इति श्रीरघुनन्दनभट्टाचार्यविरचितायां धर्म्मसिद्धान्तसंहिता-
यामशौचाद्याचारपरिष्कारे षष्ठोऽध्यायः ॥६॥

माङ्गल्यं येनैव येनार्थसिद्धिर्धर्म्मो यस्मात्कामसंपूर्तिरस्ति ।
मुक्तिः सर्वेष्टार्थसिद्धिश्च येन सर्वेशायास्मै नमः कर्मणेऽत्र ॥१॥
पूर्तिः केषाञ्चिद्विपाकः फलाय कुम्भस्येवाम्भस्समाकर्षणाय ।
केषां चिद्वेलानुकूलो विपाकः पाकाम्राणां कर्मणान्तद्वदेव ॥२॥
वैफल्यं नैवास्ति केषांचिदेव यान्यारब्धानि क्रमैः पूरितानि ।
यानि त्यक्तान्यन्तरे वर्द्धितानि क्षेत्रस्थानीवाशु नश्यन्ति तानि ॥३॥
पूर्तिर्येषां कर्मणां येऽतिधीराः ये विद्वांसो निस्स्पृहा ये च वीराः ।
तेषां कर्माणि स्वयं वर्द्धितानि भूयो भूयो भूरि भावैः फलन्ति ॥४॥
धन्याः प्रोच्यन्ते त एवात्र कार्यं प्रारभ्याद्धा निष्फलं न त्यजन्ति ।
ये तु प्रारब्धं त्यजन्ति स्वभावात्ते वै मूढा भाग्यहीनास्त एव ॥५॥
ये वा न्यद्द्रव्याण्यनिष्टप्रचारैर्ध्यायन्तो वैतथ्यमावेशयन्ति ।
जायन्ते तेऽन्त्यासु योनिष्ववश्यं जन्मान्ते वा यद्विपाकः फलाय ॥६॥
पैशून्ये वाचानृते ये प्रवृत्ता येऽसङ्गत्या वाचमुच्चारयन्ति ।
पक्षिष्वेते वा मृगादिष्वधोऽन्ते जायन्ते ते जन्तवः सम्भवे तु ॥७॥
योऽवाग्दत्तग्राहको वा परस्त्रीसेवासक्तो हिंसकश्चाविधानैः ।
सोऽन्ते स्वप्रारब्धकर्म्मप्रभावाद्भ्रष्टाचारः स्थावरे जायतेऽसौ ॥८॥
यश्चात्मज्ञः शौचयुक्तस्तपस्वी दान्तः शान्तः सत्यवादीन्द्रियार्थे ।
शुद्धो धर्मात्मा कृतज्ञः स चान्ते विद्याभिज्ञो देवयोनिम्प्रयाति ॥९॥

यश्चासत्कार्ये रतोऽधीरवृत्तिर्यो वा प्रारंभाकुलस्सर्वदैव।
यश्चात्मीयानात्मनो मन्यमानो नृणां योनौ जायते राजसेन ॥१०॥
निद्रालुर्लुब्धोऽथवा क्रूरकर्मा नास्तिक्ये वा याचने यत्प्रवृत्तिः।
भिन्ना वृत्तिर्यस्य यो वा प्रमादी तिर्यग्योनौ जायते तामसेन ॥११॥
यस्स्याल्लोके राजसस्तामसो वानिष्टैर्भावैरावृतोऽनिष्टवृत्तौ।
संसाराब्धौ दुष्टसेवाघपारे शोकाविष्टः स भ्रमत्येव जन्तुः ॥१२॥
मालिन्येनादर्शमध्ये न रूपाण्यालोक्यन्ते तद्वदेवान्तरात्मा।
मालिन्योपेतस्य चापक्वबुद्धेराविर्भावं नैति कर्म्मोदयाय ॥१३॥
न्यायेनैवार्थान् समीहेत तत्त्वज्ञानोद्योगी श्राद्धकृत् सत्यवादी।
निर्मुक्तः स ज्ञायते यस्तु पापाढ्यः स्याल्लोके नारकीं याति योनिम् ॥१४
कर्मक्षीणाः पापिनो ये भवन्ति तेषामुत्पत्ति यथाकर्मयोग्याम्।
क्रमस्तां श्रुत्वा स्वकर्मप्रवृत्ता भूयो भूयो मानवा यद्भवन्तु ॥१५॥
यो ब्रह्मघ्नो जायतेऽसौ मृगश्ववाराहोष्ट्राणां विशेषेण योनौ।
विप्रो मद्यं यः पिबत्येष योनौ चाण्डालीनां गार्दभीनां प्रयाति ॥१६॥
यादृक्कर्माण्याचरेद्यो मनुष्यस्तादृग्योनौ जायते निर्वसत्त्वे।
तस्मात्प्रायश्चित्तमारभ्यतेऽद्य वक्तुं तेषां कर्मणामानुपूर्व्यात् ॥१७॥
पापात्मानो ये नराः कर्मशुद्धिं नो कुर्वन्ति प्रायशस्ते प्रयान्ति।
व्यग्रात्मानो नारकीं योनिमेतैर्भूयो भूयो नारकीयैः सहैव ॥१८॥
ब्रह्मघ्नो वा मद्यपस्तेनवृत्तिः गुर्व्या यो वा भार्यया संगतश्च।
प्रायश्चित्तार्हो महापापकर्मा यो वा लोके पाप्मना याति सार्द्धम् ॥१९॥
निन्दां कुर्वाणो गुरूणामथापि वेदानां वा मित्रबन्धवादिचिन्ताम्।
स ब्रह्मघ्नेनैव तुल्योऽथ यो वा प्राधीत्यार्थान्नाशयत्यल्पहेतोः ॥२०॥
जैह्म्यञ्चोत्कर्षेऽनृतं भक्षणं वा वर्ज्यानां स्त्रीणां रजोऽभिप्लुतानाम्।
सङ्गास्य स्वादौ च कृत्वा सुरापीतुल्यः प्रायश्चित्तयोग्यो मनुष्यः ॥२१॥
अश्वस्त्रीरत्नादिभूधेनुनिक्षेपादीनां चौर्य्यं सुवर्णस्य चौर्य्यम्।
मित्रस्त्री कन्या स्वयोन्यन्त्यजासु पुत्रस्त्री गोत्रप्रसूतासु तुल्यम् ॥२२॥
आचार्य्यस्त्री मातुलानी तथैव पैतृष्वस्री या स्वसा स्वा च पित्रोः।
पुत्री स्वा स्वाचार्य्यपुत्री तथैव गुर्वी प्रायश्चित्तिरासां प्रसङ्गे ॥२३॥
लिङ्गस्यात्रच्छेदनं शुद्धिरस्ति पुंसः प्राबल्यं स्त्रियाश्चेद्वधोऽस्ति।
तौल्ये तुल्यं चोभयोः स्त्री त्ववध्या मुण्डीभूता या विदेशं प्रयातु ॥२४॥

स्तेयं हिंसा गोरकालव्रतित्वं देयर्णानामक्रियानग्निता च।
भृत्याध्यायाध्यापने विक्रयश्च पण्यानां वा पारिवेद्यं तथैव ॥२५॥
अन्यस्त्रीणां संगमः पारिवित्यं वार्धुष्यं वा कारिता सद्रसानाम्।
क्षत्रस्त्रीविट्शूद्रहिंसाथ निन्द्यप्राप्यार्थेनोज्जीवनं नास्तिकत्वम् ॥२६॥
पुत्रादीनां विक्रयश्चाव्रतित्वं पित्रोस्त्यागो विक्रयः स्वात्मजायाः।
वाप्यादीनां वा पशुस्तेयता च धान्यानां धात्वादिकानामथापि ॥२७॥
कर्मारम्भश्चात्मनो मद्यपस्त्रीसेवा स्वाध्यायाग्निबन्ध्वात्मजानाम्।
त्यागो वृक्षच्छेदनं स्त्रीवधोपि भैषज्यं हिंसार्थयन्त्रप्रकारः ॥२८॥
शूद्रप्रेष्यत्वं तथा हीनसख्यं हीनस्त्रीसङ्गः सदाखेटनञ्च।
प्रायश्चित्तार्हो यथानाश्रमत्वे तद्वद्वाच्यश्चात्मनो विक्रयेपि ॥२९॥
नैर्गुण्येऽप्यन्नान्नसंपुष्टता च चार्वाकादेश्शास्त्रसंपादनानि।
मण्यादीनामाकराधीश्वरत्वं प्रायश्चित्तेनैव शुद्धिस्तथैषाम् ॥३०॥
ब्रह्मघ्नः कापालिको भिक्षुवृत्तिर्भयः कर्मावेदयन् द्वादशाब्दम्।
स्वल्पान्नाशी शुद्धिमाप्नोति तीर्थस्नानैस्सद्ध्यानैस्तथा सोपवासैः ॥३१॥
विप्राणां वा रक्षणाद्वा दशानां गोनां यज्ञैरश्वमेधादिकानाम्।
स्नाने चान्यत्कर्तृकाणामपीह ब्रह्मघ्नो दोषाद्विनिर्मुक्तिमेति ॥३२॥
दृष्ट्वा मार्गे तीव्ररोगार्त्तदेहान्विप्रान् गामार्तान्निरालम्बिनीश्च।
यो वा निःक्लेशान् दयार्द्रः करोति ब्रह्मघ्नोपि प्रायशो मुच्यतेऽत्र ॥३३॥
विप्राणां यच्चाहृतं द्रव्यमन्यैश्चौरैः तेभ्यस्तत्समाहृत्य सर्वम्।
दद्याच्चेत्स्त्रैर्घातितस्तैस्मजीवन्मुक्तो ब्रह्मघ्नोऽथ तद्रक्षणेन ॥३४॥
लोमभ्यः स्वाहेति मन्त्रैस्सलोममज्जां हुत्वा शुद्धिमाप्नोत्यनग्नौ।
तूलानुद्धूते स्वगृह्योक्तवह्नौ गोघ्नो ब्रह्मघ्नो गुरोस्तल्पगोपि ॥३५॥
संग्रामे वाऽलक्षितः शस्त्रपातैर्विद्धो नद्धो मूर्छितोपि प्रहारैः।
दृष्ट्वा लोकैरुच्यते चेन्मृतोऽयमित्थंजीवद्ब्रह्महादेर्विशुद्धिः ॥३६॥
विद्वान्वेदानभ्यसेद्द्वादशाब्दं पुण्यारण्ये स्रोतसि श्रेयसीनाम्।
गङ्गादीनां वा व्रतैः कृच्छ्रकृच्छ्रैस्तावत्कालैर्ब्रह्महा मुच्यतेऽसौ ॥३७॥
एषा प्रोक्ताऽकामतो ब्रह्महत्या तस्याः शुद्धिः कामतो याचनास्याः।
मद्यं पीत्वा ब्राह्मणः क्षत्रियो वा वैश्यो मध्याग्न्याहुतौ शुद्धिमेति ॥३८॥
गोमूत्रं वा गोपयो वा जलं वा सर्पिस्तप्तं वा पिबेन्मद्यशुद्धौ।
अज्ञानात्पाने विशुद्धिश्च दुःखाज्ज्ञानान्मृत्युः पानशुद्धिः सुरायाः ॥३९॥

यद्वा पिण्याकं कणान् वा दिनान्ते भक्षेदादब्दान्तनक्तव्रतेन ।
कुट्यां स्थित्वा वालवासा जटी च ज्ञातो लोकैर्मद्यप: शुद्धिमेति ।।४०।।
गौडी पैष्टी या च माध्वी सुरा सा सर्वा प्रोक्ता या द्विजातेरयोग्या ।
भोक्तुं यस्या यक्षरक्ष:पिशाचा: पीत्वा मुह्यन्त्यासवं ज्ञानहीना: ।।४१।।
मद्योन्मत्तं जायते ज्ञानमस्य भ्रष्टं तस्माद्धीयते चात्मवृत्ति: ।
हानौ चास्या: शूद्रतामेति भूयश्शूद्रत्वे वा नारकीं याति योनिम् ।।४२।।
स्वर्णस्तेये तद्वदेव व्रतित्वं यादृग्ब्रह्मघ्नस्य शुद्धाविहोक्तम् ।
गुर्व्या तल्पे योऽभिघातोऽभिभाष्य स्वप्यात्तल्पेऽयोमये शुद्धिहेतो: ।।४३।।
यद्वा तल्पायोमयीं मूर्तिमेत्य प्राणत्यागेनैव शुद्धिं प्रयाति ।
शिश्नं वोत्कृत्य स्वयञ्चोपधाय पाणौ तिष्ठेन्नैर्ऋतीमानिपातात् ।।४४।।
श्रीर्जयति प्राजापत्यं कृच्छ्रमब्दान्तरे तु पुण्यारण्ये निर्जले श्मश्रुलेन ।
खट्वाङ्गाङ्गेन स्वयं चीरवस्त्रेण भ्रान्त्या गुर्वीं गतेनेह कार्य्यम् ।।४५।।
त्रीन्मासांश्चान्द्रायणं वाभ्यसन्त: संयम्यैहैवेन्द्रियाणीन्द्रियार्थे ।
गुर्वीङ्गत्वाऽज्ञानतो यान्ति शुद्धिमुत्पन्नैर्वा ये यवाग्वा भवन्ति ।।४६।।
अज्ञानाद्येनाहतो गौर्मृतश्चेद्गोघ्न: स प्रोक्त: परं तस्य शुद्धि: ।
गोष्ठे वासान्मुण्डनाच्चर्मणैवाच्छन्नस्यात्मैवं दिनान्तव्रतेन ।।४७।।
कृत्वा गोमूत्रेण च स्नानमादौ प्रातर्गोष्ठाद्गास्तथैवानुगच्छेत् ।
गावो गच्छेयुर्यथैव स्वतन्त्राश्शुश्रूषित्वं मूत्रमूद्ध्वं पिबेच्च ।।४८।।
तिष्ठन्तीष्वेतासु तिष्ठेद् व्रजन्तीरेता दृष्ट्वानुव्रजेत्स व्रतस्थ: ।
आसीनास्वास्थाय वीरासनेन रात्रौ रक्षाकर्मणि स्यात्प्रवृत्त: ।।४९।।
स्वल्पं चाक्षारान्नमद्याच्च रात्रौ सर्वोपायैरर्चयेत्सर्वदैव ।
यस्त्रीन्मासात् तस्य चैनो व्यपैति श्रद्धायुक्तस्यैव गोपालनेन ।।५०।।
शुद्धोदयाद्गा दशैकं वृषञ्च विप्रेभ्यो द्वैकादशेभ्य: क्रमेण ।
दानासामर्थ्ये च सर्वस्वदानव्याधूतान्त:पातकी जायतेऽसौ ।।५१।।
एवं सर्वेषूपपातात्मकेषु प्रायश्चित्तं पातकेष्पयुक्तम् ।
भिन्नं यच्चेहावकीर्णिव्रतेन गोघ्नश्शुद्धो याति चान्द्रायणेन ।।५२।।
यो वायोनौ ब्रह्मचारी स्वतेजो वीर्यं भूमौ पातयेत्सोऽवकीर्णी ।
वारुण्यां रात्रौ यजेद्गर्दभेन काणेनावीशञ्चतुर्मार्गमध्ये ।।५३।।
हुत्वा चाग्नौ वातगुर्विन्द्रवह्निमन्त्रैस्तत्रैवाहुती: सर्पिषापि ।
स्वात्मानञ्चावृत्य सत्याश्रमेषु भिक्षां लिप्सेच्चर्मणा गार्दभेन ।।५४।।

कर्माविधस्वीयमालब्धभिक्षोर्जीवेद्धूक्ष्येणैकदा प्राशितेन।
प्रातर्मध्याह्नेऽथ सायं विधाय स्नानं शुद्धो जायते वर्षमब्दे ॥५५॥
प्राजापत्यं कृच्छ्रसन्तापने च जातिभ्रष्टं शुद्धिमाप्नोति कृत्वा।
प्रत्येकञ्चाज्ञानतो भ्रष्टजातेस्तन्निर्दिष्टं सद्व्रतं शुद्धिहेतु ॥५६॥
साङ्कर्य्ये वाऽपात्रतायां व्रतेन शुद्धिर्लोकानान्तु चान्द्रायणेन।
मालिन्ये चान्तर्गते स्यात्त्र्यहेण शुद्धिः पानात्तापिताया यवाग्वाः ॥५७॥
यज्ञारंभादौ स्थितक्षत्रियस्य घाते तुर्यो ब्रह्महत्याव्रतस्य।
वैश्याघाते सार्धवर्षव्रतेन शुद्धिः शूद्रादौ भवेत्षोडशांशा ॥५८॥
हत्वा राजन्यं वृथा ब्राह्मणेन विप्राः पूज्या गोसहस्रप्रदानैः।
शुद्धौ कृत्वार्चां जटी त्र्यब्दमात्रं तिष्ठेद्विप्रो ब्रह्मचारिव्रतित्वे ॥५९॥
एतच्चाब्दं वैश्यघाते विधेयं विप्रेभ्यो वा गोशतं देयमत्र।
एतत्षण्मासव्रतं शूद्रघाते गावो देया धर्मयुक्ता दशैव ॥६०॥
श्रीः मार्ज्जारं मण्डूकचाषश्वगोधोलूकान् हत्वा शूद्रवत् शुद्धिमेति।
पीत्वा यो वा योजनेनाध्वनीनः स्नात्वा नद्याम्वाश्रयेग त्रिरात्रम् ॥६१॥
सर्पं हत्वा लोहदण्डं द्विजाग्र्यो दद्यात्क्लीवे माषकं सीसकञ्च।
सर्पिः कुम्भं शूकरे तित्तिरौ तु तैलद्रोणीं तु त्रिवर्षैकवत्सम् ॥६२॥
क्रौंचे दद्याद्वा शुकान्ते द्विवर्षं हंसं हत्वा वा बलाकां बकञ्च।
श्येनं भासं बर्हिणं वानरं वा दत्वा गां विप्राय शुद्धिं प्रयाति ॥६३॥
वासो दद्यादश्वघाते द्विजाय तुल्यं तेनाश्वेन यत्स्यात्तुलायाम्।
पञ्चोन्मत्तान्नीलवर्णान् वृषांस्तु प्रायश्चित्ते हस्तिनो ब्राह्मणेभ्यः ॥६४॥
दद्याद्हत्वाजञ्च मेषं द्विजायानड्वाहं हत्वा खरन्त्वेकवर्षम्।
क्रव्यादान् हत्वा मृगान्धेनुमेकां दद्याद्विप्राय स्वयं स्तन्यशीलाम् ॥६५॥
अक्रव्यादान् गां सवत्सामथोष्ट्रं हत्वा दद्यात्कृष्णलं ब्राह्मणाय।
चातुर्वर्णस्त्रीविघाते क्रमेण कृष्णं मार्गं सद्धनुः छागमेषौ ॥६६॥
दानासामर्थ्ये स कुर्य्याच्च कृच्छ्रैः प्रत्येकस्मिन्प्राणिघाते विशुद्धिम्।
सास्थीनान्तु प्राणिनां यत्सहस्रं हत्वानस्थ्नां कोटिशस्तुल्यमेव ॥६७॥
साफल्येनोद्भावनीयांश्च वृक्षान् छित्वा गायत्र्या जपाच्छुद्धिरस्ति।
सत्त्वानामन्नादिजानां फलेभ्यः प्रोद्भूतानां भक्षणं सर्पिषोऽस्ति ॥६८॥
संभृतानां वा वने कृष्टजानामोषध्यादीनां वृथालम्भने तु।
प्रातः प्रारभ्यानुगच्छेद्दिनान्ते दुग्धप्राशी शुद्धिमाप्नोत्यभीष्टाम् ॥६९॥

इति श्रीरघुनन्दनभट्टाचार्यविरचितायां धर्मसिद्धान्तसंहितायां
हिंसाजनितप्रायश्चित्तपरिस्कारे सप्तमोऽध्यायः ।।७।।

अथाज्ञानतो भक्षितेऽभक्षणीये भवेद्यद्विशुद्धाविहैतन्मयात्र ।
भवद्भ्यस्समृद्धाश्रमाचारजेभ्यो ब्रवीम्यागमज्ञानविद्याश्रितेभ्यः ।।१।।
यो वाऽज्ञानान्मद्यपानं करोति शुद्धिश्चात्मीयास्य संस्कारजन्या ।
ज्ञात्वा प्राणाघातपूर्वा विशुद्धिः प्रायश्चित्तैर्ब्रह्मविट्क्षत्रियाणाम् ।।२।।
आपो न्यस्ताः शुद्धपात्रे विशुद्धास्तांश्चाशुद्धा वारुणीभाण्डसंस्थाः ।
गाङ्गां वा पीत्वा पिबेच्छंखपुष्पां तोयं पक्वं पंचरात्रक्रमेण ।।३।।
स्पृष्ट्वा दत्वा वा सुरां च प्रगृह्य पीत्वा शूद्रोच्छिष्टमम्भोथवान्यत् ।
आघ्रायैनां वा द्विजातिर्विशुद्धौ कौशक्वाथं वा पिबेत्पंचरात्रम् ।।४।।
आघ्रायास्यं मद्यपस्याशु विप्रस्सोमं पीत्वाप्सु त्रिवारं निमज्ज्य ।
प्राणानायम्याद्भिराचम्य पश्चात्पीत्वा सर्पिः शुद्धिमाप्नोति लोके ।।५।।
विण्मूत्रं स्पृष्टं सुरां वा पिबेद्यः संस्कारार्होऽज्ञानतो जायतेऽसौ ।
विप्रो वैश्यः क्षत्रियः संस्कृतौ तु कुर्याद्भैक्ष्यं नैव दण्डाजिनं च ।।६।।
स्त्रीशूद्रोच्छिष्टान्नमद्यादभोज्यं मांसं वा शुद्धिस्तदा सप्तरात्रैः ।
पीत्वा शक्तून् क्वाथशुक्तादिकांस्तु शुद्धान्भुक्त्वा शुद्धिरापाकतोऽस्ति ।।७।।
गोमायूष्ट्रादेर्वराहस्य वापि कप्यादीनां वा तथा वायसस्य ।
भुक्त्वा मूत्रं वा पुरीषं द्विजन्मा शुध्यत्यज्ञायापि चान्द्रायणेन ।।८।।
भुक्त्वा वा तैः शुष्कमांसानि छत्रामज्ञातस्वैतचच सूणागृहस्थम् ।
चान्द्राच्छुद्धिः शूकरग्राम्यपक्षिक्रव्यादानां भक्षणे कृच्छ्रशुद्धिः ।।९।।
मासं श्राद्धान्नञ्च येऽश्नन्ति तैस्तु ब्रह्माध्यायस्थैस्त्र्यहेणोपवास्य ।
कार्या शुद्धिर्वोदके चैकरात्रं स्थित्वा गायत्रीजपान्मध्यगेऽर्के ।।१०।।
मांसं वाश्नीयान्मधु ब्रह्मचारी चेत्स प्रायश्चित्तमाकल्प्य कुर्यात् ।
कृच्छ्रं राखूच्छिष्टमन्योर्ज्झितं वा भुक्ताच्छुद्धौ पूतिमात्मव्रतस्य ।।११।।
धान्यान्नानां वा धनस्येह चौर्य्यं कृत्वा शुद्ध्यत्यब्दकृच्छ्रव्रतेन ।
स्त्रीक्षेत्राणां वा मनुषस्य कूपवापीनां शुद्धिस्तु चान्द्रायणेन ।।१२।।
अल्पद्रव्याणान्तु चौर्य्येऽन्यसद्मसंस्थानां शुद्धौ तु संतापनं तत् ।
कृच्छ्रम्भोज्याभक्ष्यशय्याशनानां शुद्धिर्गव्यं पुष्पमूलादिकानाम् ।।१३।।
शुष्कान्नानां काष्ठवृक्षामिषाणां चर्म्मासीनां वा गुडानां तृणानाम् ।
चौर्य्ये शुध्यन्ति त्रिरात्रव्रतेन वन्यानां सर्वौषधीनां विशेषात् ।।१४।।

ताम्रादेर्वा कांस्यमुक्ताप्रवालमाणिक्यानां वोपलापोमयानाम् ।
शुद्धिर्विप्राणां कणान्नादनेन शुद्ध्यत्येवं क्षत्रियो द्वादशाहैः ।।१५।।
कार्पासानां कीटजोर्णाम्बराणां गन्धादीनां पक्षिरज्वादिकानाम् ।
चौर्य्ये शुद्ध्यन्ति त्र्यहेणैव पीत्वा शुक्लाया गोः क्षीरमम्भःसमोपे ।।१६।।
यो वोदक्यायामथामानुषीषु योनेरन्यत्र स्त्रियां पुंसि वापि ।
सिचेद्रेतस्तद्विशुद्धिस्तु कृच्छ्रैर्दानैर्वोक्ता कृच्छ्रसंतापनेन ।।१७।।
चाण्डालान्त्यस्त्रीप्रसंगे द्विजन्मा भुक्त्वा चास्या दृष्टिपाते प्रगृह्य ।
चाण्डालोऽसौ जायतेऽज्ञानपूर्वं ज्ञात्वा चासां जातिसाम्यं प्रयाति ।।१८।।
या दुष्टा स्त्री जातिसाम्यैर्नियुक्ता शुद्धिस्तस्याः कृच्छ्रचान्द्रायणेन ।
या त्वन्यैरालिंगिताऽस्या न शुद्धिर्देवश्राद्धादौ तथा भोजनेऽपि ।।१९।।
तस्मादेता रक्षणीयास्समन्तात् पित्रा पत्या देवरैरात्मजैर्वा ।
नासां स्वातंत्र्यं भवेद्धर्महेतु धर्म्मो यासामाश्रये स्वाश्रमाणाम् ।।२०।।
शुद्धा येषां च स्त्रियस्ते विशुद्धाः कर्माण्येषामेव सिद्धिं प्रयान्ति ।
पत्न्यो येषामन्यसंसर्गदुष्टास्ते कर्माण्यारभ्य मिथ्योन्नमन्ति ।।२१।।
एषा प्रोक्ता निष्कृतिः संगतानां विप्रादीनां पापकर्मोपचारे ।
संयुक्तानां पातितैर्धर्ममार्गात्तेषामेवाशुद्धिमावेदयामि ।।२२।।
शुद्धिर्यादृक् पातितानामिहोक्ता कार्या तत्संसर्गाशुद्धौ तथैव ।
सायाह्नेऽस्मै पातितायोदकन्तु स्वीयैर्देयं जीवते तन्निवृत्यै ।।२३।।
दासी याऽप्रापितं दक्षिणस्यामेतत्ते दास्याम्यहं पातिताय ।
एवं संभाष्य स्वयं सा ब्रवीतु पापैर्लोके त्वन्निवृत्तक्रियोसि ।।२४।।
स्त्रीणामप्येवं स्वयं पातितानामेनःशुद्धौ वस्त्रपानाशनादि ।
दत्वैनां भूयो जुगुप्सेत कश्चिन्नो धर्मज्ञस्संवसेद्वा सहैव ।।२५।।
बालघ्नैर्भूयः कृतघ्नैर्विशुद्धैः प्रायश्चित्तेनापि सार्द्धं द्विजातिः ।
नैकत्रासीत व्रतघ्नो भवेच्च स्याच्चेत्कृच्छ्रैरस्य शुद्धिस्त्रिमासैः ।।२६।।
प्रायश्चित्तं कर्तुमिच्छन्तु येऽत्र दुःकर्म्माणो दुःप्रतिग्राहकाश्च ।
तेषामप्येतद्व्रतं तावदुक्तं तस्य त्यागो येन ते दूषिताः स्युः ।।२७।।
यो वा सद्दानेन सन्दूषितोऽस्तु प्रातर्मध्याह्ने तथा सायमेषः ।
सावित्रीमामासपूतेः सहस्रसंख्या ताञ्जप्त्वा विशुद्धिं प्रयाति ।।२८।।
सायं गोक्षीरं पिबेदाविशुद्धेः शुद्धो ब्रूयाद्ब्राह्मणानाददामि ।
यच्चाग्राह्यं सत्यमेतद्धचश्चेद्ग्रासो ग्राह्योऽयं गवा धार्मिकेण ।।२९।।

एवञ्चानेकेषु पश्यत्सु विप्रेष्वागत्यैषा ग्रासमङ्गीकरोतु।
शुद्धिर्वाच्या चेत्समात्राय गच्छेन्नैषा शुद्धिर्जायते जातियोग्या ॥३०॥
व्रात्यानां यो याजको वा परेषां दाही संध्याकर्महीनोऽभिचारी।
त्रस्तान् यो न त्रायते स्वक्षमत्वे शुद्ध्यत्यब्दान्तेऽल्पकृच्छ्रव्रतेन ॥३१॥
उष्ट्रं गां चारण्यजां गर्दभं वा यो वारुह्यैव स्वभावैः प्रयाति।
स्नात्वा दिग्वासा बहिर्ब्राह्मणोऽयं प्राणायामेनैव शुद्धिं प्रयाति ॥३२॥
वेदोक्तानां कर्मणां नैत्यिकानां त्यागे च स्नातव्रतस्यापलापे।
हुंकारोक्तौ ब्राह्मणे त्वङ्कृतौ च गुर्वादौ शुद्धिर्दिवाऽभोजनेन ॥३३॥
गुर्वादीन् विप्रांस्तथा वाददेशे जित्वा वाल्पैस्ताडयित्वा तृणाद्यैः।
पापात्मायं प्रांजलिः स प्रसाद्य निर्मुक्तोऽसौ जायते पातकेभ्यः ॥३४॥
विप्रान्निर्जित्यावगूर्य्याथ कृच्छ्रम् शुद्धौ हत्वैनं तथैवातिकृच्छ्रम्।
कुर्यादेवं निष्कृतीः सर्वपापप्रायश्चित्तार्थोपयोग्याः सदैव ॥३५॥
प्रातर्भुञ्जीत त्र्यहं सायमेवं पश्चादद्याच्च त्र्यहं याचितान्यत्।
किंचिन्नाश्नीयात्त्र्यहं द्वादशाहैः शुद्धिः प्राजापत्यकृच्छ्रव्रतेन ॥३६॥
गोमूत्रं वा गोमयप्रच्युतं च क्षीरं सर्पिः कौशमम्भोदधीति।
एतानेकीकृत्य पीत्वा द्वितीये कृच्छ्रः सन्तापोपवासोऽयमुक्तः ॥३७॥
प्रातश्चैकं सायमेकं त्वनन्यग्रासं प्राश्यैव त्र्यहादिक्रमेण।
पश्चाच्चानश्नन्स्त्र्यहं द्वादशाहैश्शुद्ध्यत्येवं चातिकृच्छ्रव्रतेन ॥३८॥
तोयं क्षीरं सर्पिरेतत् त्र्यहेषु तप्तं पीत्वा स्वक्रमेणैकदैव।
भुंजाना वायुं चतुर्थेह्नि लोकाः शुद्ध्यन्त्येवं तप्तकृच्छ्रव्रतेन ॥३९॥
नद्यास्तीरे वा वने पुण्यदेशे स्थित्वा कार्या द्वादशाहव्रतेन।
शुद्धिर्वायुप्राशनैर्या पराकः प्रोक्तः सर्वत्रैव कृच्छ्रव्रतोऽयम् ॥४०॥
कृष्णे ग्रासह्रासपूर्वाशिनेन चन्द्रज्योत्स्ना स्वाप्रकाशक्रमेण।
शुक्ले तद्वृद्धौ तथैवानुपूर्व्या शुद्धिः कार्या मासि चान्द्रायणेन ॥४१॥
शुक्ले पक्षे वर्द्धनानुक्रमेण संवर्द्ध्यैवं ह्रासयेत्कृष्णपक्षे।
ग्रासानेषा मध्यवीर्या विशुद्धिः प्रोक्ता तस्मान्मध्यचान्द्रायणं तत् ॥४२॥
अष्टौ ग्रासान् मासमेकं यतात्मा मध्याह्नेऽश्नीयाद्धविष्यप्रयुक्तान्।
एवं या शुद्धिः परा सा यतीनामात्मशुद्धौ पूर्णचान्द्रायणेन ॥४३॥
बालोऽश्नीयाच्चेच्चतुर्बद्धपिण्डान् संस्काराहैः प्रातरेवन्दिनान्ते।
मासान्ते शुद्ध्यत्यतो बालकानां शुद्धिः कार्या बालचान्द्रायणेन ॥४४॥

कृत्वैवैतद्द्वादशादित्यरूपा रुद्रास्तत्तत्कालभूपास्तपन्ति ।
वाता वान्ति ब्रह्मविज्ञानयुक्ता मुक्ता जायन्ते महर्ष्यादयो ये ॥४५॥
होमं कुर्य्यात्प्रत्यहं स त्रिवारं प्रातर्मध्याह्ने सवासाश्च सायम् ।
स्नात्वाऽहिंसां सत्यमक्रोधमार्य्यवृत्त्यौदार्यादीन् सदैवाचरेच्च ॥४६॥
स्त्रीशूद्राभ्यां भाषणञ्चान्त्यजेन शय्यास्वापस्त्यज्यतां सव्रतेन ।
वाचं गुर्वीमाश्रितेनेह तेन कार्य्यः सावित्र्या जपो वाचकेन ॥४७॥
कृत्वा पूर्वोक्तव्रतं स द्विजातिः शुद्ध्यत्यद्धा यः पुराविष्कृतैनाः ।
येनाविष्कुर्वन्ति तेषां विशुद्धिर्मन्त्रैर्होमैर्देवताराधनेन ॥४८॥
आख्यातं चैनः प्रशाम्यत्युपायैस्तापैर्वा स्वाध्यापनैस्सत्तपोभिः ।
दानैर्वानल्पैरथापद्विधेयैः शुद्धिः प्रोक्तेयं मुमूर्षोर्विशेषात् ॥४९॥
कृत्वाऽधर्मं यः स्वयं भाषतेऽत्र निर्मुक्तोऽसौ जायते पातकेभ्यः ।
तीर्थं गत्वैवं सभायामथापि नेच्छेच्चेदेनं पुनः कर्तुमेनः ॥५०॥
पश्चात्तापांते विशुद्ध्यन्ति येषां वाचस्संकल्पोचिता निस्सरन्ति ।
नैवं कुर्मः कर्मधर्मव्यपेतं यावज्जीवामीति चेन्निश्चितार्थाः ॥५१॥
अज्ञानाद्वा ज्ञानतो गर्हणीयं कृत्वा सन्तप्याचरेन्न द्वितीयम् ।
चेन्निर्मुक्तः पातकेभ्योऽतिकृच्छ्रोपापेभ्योऽसौ जायतेऽवाचितेभ्यः ॥५२॥
प्रायश्चित्ते कारिते वा कृते च न स्याच्चेतश्शुद्धिरस्यास्त्यशुद्धिः ।
तावत्कुर्यात्कर्म यावन्न चेतस्संतुष्यत्यद्धा स्वयं कर्मकर्तुः ॥५३॥
ज्ञानं विप्राणां तपः क्षत्रियाणां रक्षा वाणिज्यं तपो नैगमस्य ।
शूद्रस्योक्तं सेवनं स्वोच्छ्रितानां सर्वेषां प्रायस्तपःशुद्धिरुक्ता ॥५४॥
दुःप्राप्यं यद्दुर्गमं दुस्तरं वा दुष्कार्य्यं स्याद्दुर्निरीक्ष्यन्तथैव ।
पापाविष्टैश्शिष्टकर्मानुरूपविद्योपेतैस्तत्तपस्साध्यमस्ति ॥५५॥
सर्वश्रेष्ठं निग्रहः स्वेन्द्रियाणां दुष्कर्म्मभ्यो मानसं तत्तपोऽस्ति ।
मन्त्रस्तोत्रादिर्भवेद्वाचिकन्तत् कर्मप्राप्यं कृच्छ्रयागादिरस्ति ॥५६॥
सत्या वाचो रूपमव्याहता वाक् वागीशासिद्धिश्च धर्मप्रवृत्तिः ।
सद्विद्यैश्वर्यं तथा सत्प्रसूतिर्जायन्ते चैते तपःकारणेन ॥५७॥
यद्यत्प्राप्नोत्यश्वमेधे फलं यत्सर्वं प्रायश्चित्तकर्मोपयोग्यम् ।
तत्तत्प्राप्नोति त्र्यहेणोपवास्य त्रिः स्नात्वा जप्त्वाघमर्षं क्रमेण ॥५८॥
वेद्यं वेदाद्यैरनेकैः परं यज्ज्ञानान्मुक्तिर्ब्रह्म चैकाक्षरं तत् ।
यस्याभ्यासान्मुच्यते पातकेभ्यः सर्वेभ्यो ब्रह्मोपवासत्रयेण ॥५९॥

यद्ध्यात्वा ब्रह्मासृजत्सर्वमादौ विष्णुर्यद्ध्यात्वैव रक्षां करोति।
रुद्रो रौद्रीभावमेत्य स्वभावाद्ध्यात्वा यद्ब्रह्माक्षरं हन्ति लोकान् ॥६०॥
शिष्येभ्यः श्रद्धान्वितेभ्यो मयोक्ता सर्वप्रायश्चित्तयोग्या विशुद्धिः।
श्रुत्वाप्येनां संहितामर्थयुक्तामध्यायं वा मुच्यते पातकेभ्यः ॥६१॥
प्रातः स्नात्वा विमलसरितामम्भसैवोपवासश्च
ध्यात्वा पादत्रयमिह पुनर्निग्रहे वामनस्य।
सार्थेनार्थोदयबलवताकारितेनास्य धर्म-
व्याख्यानस्य श्रुतिरिह सुधापक्षपारायणेन ॥६२॥

इति श्रीरघुनन्दनसिद्धान्तभट्टाचार्यविरचितायां धर्मसिद्धान्त-
संहितायां प्रायश्चित्तनिरूपणे अष्टमोऽध्यायः ॥८॥

अथ कथमपि कर्मकारिणोऽत्र व्यवहृतिरद्य निगद्यते विशेषात्।
नृपतिबलविवर्द्धिनी विनीतैर्ध्रुवमभिमन्त्रिभिरीक्षिता क्षणेन ॥१॥
आप्तैर्विद्वद्ब्राह्मणैर्मन्त्रिवर्य्यै राजा पश्येत्कर्मिणां कर्मदोषान्।
प्रातः स्नात्वा शुद्धवाग्वैभवेन संसत्प्राप्तान् शासयेच्छासनीयान् ॥२॥
वेद्यां तिष्ठेदक्षमुद्यम्य पाणिमुच्चैरेवोच्चासने धर्ममूर्तिः।
देशे काले चागमेनाविरुद्धान् ज्ञात्वाऽरुद्धान् कारयेद्वा विशुद्धान् ॥३॥
शास्त्रार्थज्ञैर्मन्त्रिभिर्देशकालदृष्टार्थैरामन्त्रिताभिः स्ववाग्भिः।
कुर्याद्राजाष्टादशानां विवादोद्धारं वारं वारमेतान् विविच्य ॥४॥
तेषां मध्येऽष्टादशानामृणस्यादानं निःक्षेपो ग्रहोऽनीश्वरस्य।
दत्तस्यादानं पुनर्वेतनस्यादानं संभूयोत्थितिर्वादहेतु ॥५॥
संस्थायाश्चातिक्रमश्चानुतापः क्रीते विक्रीतेऽथ सीमाविवादः।
पारुष्यं दण्डादिषु स्वामिभृत्यसंवादस्तेयं तथा साहसश्च ॥६॥
अन्यस्त्रीणां संग्रहः स्त्रीविवादः पुंसा द्यूतं दायभागस्तथैव।
वाच्यार्थस्यापह्नुतिर्वाददेशे द्रष्टव्यान्येतानि राज्ञा स्थितानि ॥७॥
दृष्ट्वा कुर्यान्निर्णयश्चाश्रितानां भूयो भूयश्चात्मजानां पितेव।
विद्वांसं वा ब्राह्मणं तत्र कृत्वा निर्णेतारं भूपतिर्भावमेतु ॥८॥
स त्वन्यैर्विद्वद्वरैरावृतोपि संपश्येत्कार्याणि चावेदयेच्च।
राज्ञेऽपूर्वोपस्थितो राजमंत्री यन्त्रागारं कारयेत्सर्वहेतु ॥९॥
यद्राष्ट्रे सीदन्ति विप्राश्च गावः पापार्ताः क्लिश्यन्ति यस्याश्रयेण।
राज्ञस्तस्यैवापराधात्ततस्तद्भिक्षाहेतोः कारयेद्धर्मशालाम् ॥१०॥

यत्राधर्मेणोपविद्धस्सभायां धर्मो(?)विद्धाः मन्त्रिणस्तेन तावत्।
यावत्सत्यां वाचमुच्चार्य्य नेतत् शल्योद्धारं कारयेयुर्जनानाम् ॥११॥
पादोऽधर्मस्यैति कर्तारमेवं पादस्तद्वत्साक्षिणं चाभ्युपैति।
पादः सभ्यानेति तद्वत्तृतीयः सम्यग्राजानं चतुर्थोऽभ्युपैति ॥१२॥
प्रायश्चित्तार्हो न राजा न सभ्याः शुद्धा वेशाः साक्षिणो नापि तत्र।
निन्दार्हो यस्यां सभायां विगर्ह्य स्वार्थोद्योगात्तरानितः पातकेन ॥१३॥
राज्ञा कार्यो ब्राह्मणोऽस्यां सभायां द्रष्टा यस्यां शूद्रबाहुल्यमस्ति।
वीरो धर्मज्ञोऽतिधीरः प्रवक्ता कार्यश्चार्यब्राह्मणो नैव शूद्रः ॥१४॥
राज्ञो धर्मान्वेषणं यस्य शूद्राः कुर्वन्त्युर्व्यां राज्यसंपातनानि।
तस्यैवाद्धावद्धहस्तास्तथापि युद्धादावारुद्धहस्ता भवन्ति ॥१५॥
तद्राष्ट्रं नास्तिक्ययुक्तं तथैव शूद्रैर्भूयिष्टं विनश्यत्यशेषम्।
दुर्भिक्षाक्रान्तं तथा व्याधियुक्तं यद्यच्छूद्रैर्निर्दयैः पीडितञ्च ॥१६॥
स्वाधिष्ठाय स्वासनञ्चाग्रजन्मा संवीतांगो लोकपालान् प्रणम्य।
अर्थानर्थौ वाकलय्येह भूयो धर्माधर्मौ चिन्तयेच्चागतानाम् ॥१७॥
बाह्यैर्भावैर्भावयेद्भावमन्तर्गूढं मूढानाममौढ्योदयानाम्।
वाग्भिर्लोके साक्षिभिर्वाचिताभिर्ज्ञात्वान्तर्भावं नियुञ्जीत कार्यम् ॥१८॥
चक्षुर्वर्णांगेंगिताकारगत्या मत्या बुद्ध्वाद्धा विशुद्धान् विधाय।
पञ्च न्यायं वञ्चकांश्चाशु दण्डयोग्यान् ज्ञात्वाऽऽशुद्धिमारोधयेच्च ॥१९॥
यावद्बाल्यं स्वप्रजानान्तु रिक्थं दायादेभ्यो दापयेत् पालयेच्च।
राजाऽपुत्राणां तथा निष्कुलानां स्त्रीणां रक्षामाचरेच्चातुराणाम् ॥२०॥
वैधव्यं वा चातुरत्वं विलोक्य स्त्रीणां पातिव्रत्यमार्गे स्थितानाम्।
दायादास्ते चौरदण्डेन दण्ड्या राज्ञा चासां ये हरेयुर्धनानि ॥२१॥
निस्स्वामिद्रव्यं विलोक्याशु भूयो द्रव्यस्वत्वेन्यागमं चानुभूय।
रक्षां कुर्य्यात्त्र्यब्दमूर्ध्वन्ततोऽस्य स्वीकारं कुर्यात्तदर्द्धव्ययेन ॥२२॥
ब्रूयाद्यश्चेत्थं ममेदं यथैव विज्ञातव्यं ज्ञायतामित्यभीरुः।
एतत्सङ्ख्यातमेतत्स्वरूपं चैतन्नामैतच्च देयं तथास्मै ॥२३॥
न ब्रूते यश्चैतदेवं ममैवं मिथ्या स्वामित्वं ब्रवीत्यन्यथैव।
स तुल्यद्रव्येण दण्ड्यो महीपैर्ग्रामान्निस्सार्योथ वाग्वैभवेन ॥२४॥
नष्टद्रव्याद्द्वादशांशं विशेषात्षष्टांशं वार्द्धक्रमात्पूर्वमेव।
राज्ञा धर्मज्ञेन चादेयमुक्तमुक्तन्याय्यान्यद्विजेभ्योऽर्पणीयम् ॥२५॥

नष्टद्रव्यग्राहिणो ग्रामचौरानुग्रानारण्यान् सदाधातिनश्च ।
बद्ध्वा सर्वस्वं यथायोग्यमेषां हृत्वा चैतैः कारयेत्कर्मयोग्यम् ।।२६।।
दृष्ट्वा पूर्व ब्राह्मणोऽशेषितानि नष्टद्रव्याण्याददीतानिवेद्य ।
विद्वान्सर्वाधीश्वरत्वेन युक्तो नोक्तो मूर्खो नष्टसर्वापहारी ।।२७।।
ज्ञात्वा चौरद्रव्यमस्वामिकं तद्दद्यादन्येभ्यो बहुभ्यो महीपः ।
गृह्णीयान्नैतत्कदाऽन्यथा तु चौरस्योक्तैर्युज्यते दोषमुख्यैः ।।२८।।
राज्ञाऽदूरे ते सदा रक्षणीयाः कर्माणि स्वान्याचरन्तो मनुष्याः ।
धीरा ये वा वीरतामेत्य राजशत्रून्सङ्ग्रामात्समुच्चाटयन्तु ।।२९।।
राजा नैवोत्पादयेत्कार्यमस्य मन्त्री वा भूपो विवादास्पदन्तु ।
श्रुत्वोद्धर्तुं पूर्वमेतद्विविच्य निस्सारं कुर्य्याद्वाक्चारणेन ।।३०।।
नान्यैराक्रान्तं त्यजेदन्यगुप्तवार्तालापैरावृतं कार्यमीशः ।
राजा धर्मान्वेषणे नित्ययुक्तो भूयात्प्रातर्भास्करालोकनेन ।।३१।।
सत्यं द्रव्याशौचकर्माण्यवेक्ष्य साक्ष्युद्धारं कारयेदागतानाम् ।
विप्रैः सद्भिर्धार्मिकैरादृतं यत्कुर्यादेतच्चाविरुद्धं प्रकल्प्य ।।३२।।
येनोपायेनोत्तमर्णान्युपैति तेनैवास्मै दापनीयानि तानि ।
राज्ञा यो वा साधयेदुत्तमर्णमात्मोद्योगेनापि नासौ निवार्य्यः ।।३३।।
देशादीन् यो नाभिधत्ते न सङ्ख्यां निर्दिश्यैवापह्नुते वोत्तमर्णः ।
पौर्वापर्य्यं नाभिधत्ते विगीतादप्येतस्माद्धीयतेऽर्थान्मनुष्यः ।।३४।।
यो ब्रूयान्मे साक्षिणस्सन्त्यनेके देहीत्युक्तो नानयेन्न्यायपूर्वम् ।
यो न ब्रूयादुत्तरं स्वोक्तमर्थं संभाव्यासौ हीयतेऽर्थात्सदैव ।।३५।।
न ब्रूतेऽर्थान् योऽभियोज्यापि दण्ड्यो राज्ञा वध्यो वा यथायोगमत्र ।
यो न प्रत्यर्थी त्रिपक्षैरपीत्थं नेदं ब्रूते हारितः स क्रमेण ।।३६।।
यावद्योऽर्थान्निह्नुते वाभिधत्ते मिथ्या तावद्दण्डयोग्यो नृपस्य ।
द्वैगुण्येनार्थस्य संभावितस्य राज्ञार्द्धं ग्राह्यं तथा स्वामिनोऽस्य ।।३७।।
आप्तान्धर्मज्ञांस्तथा पुत्रिणश्चापन्निर्मुक्तान्धनाढ्यांस्तथैव ।
ज्ञात्वार्थिप्रत्यर्थिवादे विशुद्धान् राजा कुर्यात् साक्षिणो लक्षणेन ।।३८।।
राजा ब्रूयात्साक्षिणो यूयमत्र धर्म्यां सत्यां वाचमुच्चारयन्तु ।
साक्ष्ये ये ह्युच्चारयन्तीह सत्यं ते स्वर्लोकान् यान्त्यधोऽन्येऽन्धमिश्रम् ।।३९।।
सत्या वाचो ब्रह्मरूपा भवन्ति ताश्चोक्त्वा ब्रह्माश्रमं यान्ति धीराः ।
रक्षांसि स्युः साक्षिभिः संनियुक्ताः मिथ्योक्ता यैस्तानपस्मारयन्ति ।।४०।।

आत्मा साक्षी ह्यात्मनस्तद्वदेव स्वात्मा स्वर्गादेर्गतिस्स्वात्मनोऽस्ति।
स्वात्मानं तन्नावमंस्था नृलोके साक्षीभूतं सत्यधर्मव्ययेन ।।४१।।
मन्यन्ते ये पापिनो नात्र कश्चित्साक्षी वाऽस्मच्छासिताऽधर्मकृत्ये ।
तेऽन्धाय तस्यान्तरात्मैव साक्षी सर्वज्ञोऽसौ शासिता शासनेन ।।४२।।
ब्रूहीत्येव ब्राह्मणं क्षत्रियन्तु सत्यं ब्रूहि त्वं स्वयं क्षत्रियोसि ।
देवाग्रे ब्रूहीह वैश्येति सत्यं शूद्रं पृच्छेत्सर्वतः पातयित्वा ।।४३।।
ब्रह्मघ्नस्त्रीबालमित्रद्रुहश्च ये लोकास्युस्ते मृषावादिनस्ते ।
यत्पुण्यं जन्मार्जितं ते शुनोऽस्तु ब्रूयाश्चेत्साक्ष्यं न सत्याश्रयेण ४४।।
शूद्राणां विट्क्षत्रियाणां तथैव विप्राणां वा सत्यजन्यो वधः स्यात् ।
तत्रासत्यां वाचमुच्चार्य कुर्यादार्यप्रायश्चित्तमन्त्रजपेन ।।४५ ।।
न स्युर्येषां दायिनामुत्तमर्णं साक्षीभूता केऽपि तेषां नृपेण ।
दाप्योर्थो देवालये ब्रह्मणाग्रे साक्षित्वे नैतान्समुद्दिश्य पूर्वम् ।।४६।।
लोभान्मोहाच्छैशवाद्भीतितो वा कामात्क्रोधान्मित्रसम्रक्षणे च ।
अज्ञानादालस्यभावान्मृषोक्तौ दण्ड्याः प्रोच्यन्ते यथा साक्षिणस्ते ।।४७।।
दण्डयेभ्यो दण्डान्न दद्याद्यदीशो यो वाऽदण्डयान्दण्डयेत्स प्रयाति ।
तामिश्रं घोरं परत्रेह चाशु गर्हामर्हंप्रापितामेति भूपः ।।४८।।
वाग्दण्डं कुर्यात्पुरोधिक्पदेन (?) दण्डङ्कुर्याद्दण्डितेभ्यो द्वितीयम् ।
पश्चाद्दण्डैर्द्रव्यरूपैस्तृतीयैस्तुर्येनैतान् दण्डयेद्वा वधेन ।।४९।।
कर्णौ जिह्वा चक्षुषी नासिका च हस्तोपस्थद्रव्यपादोदराणि ।
देहश्चैतानीश वेद्यानि कार्ये दण्डयान्येतानि क्रमेणेरितानि ।।५०।।
वृद्धिं गृह्णीयाद्वशिष्टोपवद्धां मासे मासेऽशीतिभागस्वरूपाम् ।
द्वौ वा गृह्णीयाच्छते धर्मपूर्वं भागौ विप्रेभ्योऽधमर्णक्रमेण ।।५१।।
भागाः प्रोक्ताः क्षत्रियस्य त्रयोऽत्र चत्वारो वैश्यस्य शूद्रस्य पञ्च ।
प्रीत्या दत्ते योत्तमर्णे शते तु मासे मासे चाधमर्णप्रबन्धे ।।५२।।
नाधौ व्याधिः सोपकारे तथैव कालासर्गो नैव तद्विक्रयोऽस्ति ।
आधिं नेच्छद्भिर्बलादाधियुक्तैर्मूल्यं देयं नैव वृद्धिः कदापि ।।५३।।
आधिश्चोपस्थापितद्रव्यमेतौ स्वोक्ताद्योग्यान्नार्हतः कालमूर्द्ध्वम् ।
कालेऽतीते व्यालमालोपनीतावेतावुक्तौ नावहार्य्यौ कदापि ।।५४।।
प्रीत्या दत्तान्यन्यकार्योपकारे गावो वाऽश्वोष्ट्रोऽथ दम्यश्च कोपि ।
नश्यन्त्येतानीह नैवातिकाले दातुः प्रीतिर्जायते यावदेव ।।५५।।

अन्धस्यान्यैर्भुज्यमानं दशाब्दं द्रव्यं तूष्णीं पश्यतोऽप्येति नाशम् ।
बालस्याप्याषोडशाद्भुज्यमानमन्येनान्धस्यैव तद्द्रव्यमस्ति ॥५६॥
सीमालब्धव्याधिराधिश्च बालद्रव्यं निक्षेपो निधिर्ब्राह्मणस्वम् ।
राजद्रव्यं च स्त्रियो सोपधानं भुक्तं नैतन्नश्यति द्वादशाब्दैः ॥५७॥
स्वात्म्यज्ञातं चाधिमाराधमानो दद्यादर्द्धां वृद्धिमात्मोदयाय ।
नातिक्रम्येयं पुनर्वर्द्धतेऽत्र द्वैगुण्यं द्रव्यस्य वृद्धिं क्रमेण ॥५८॥
धान्यं वृद्धया धारितं सोपकारि वर्षान्ते तद्वर्द्धते पंचकृत्वः ।
तच्चेद्रोगो वाहकाद्यैरयुक्तो वृद्धया सार्द्धं जायते वर्षमात्रे ॥५९॥
पूर्वोक्तं पंचाशता वृद्धिमेति वर्षप्रामाण्यैर्दशाब्दान्तराले ।
धान्यं चोपस्कारहीनं दशान्ते शीघ्रं ग्राह्यं पंचधा वर्द्धितं तत् ॥६०॥
वृद्धिर्ग्राह्या वार्षिकी वर्षमध्ये नैनामुल्लंघ्याहरेच्चक्रवृद्धया ।
दातुं चाशक्तन्निरीक्ष्योत्तमर्णो जातां वृद्धिं वर्द्धयेल्लेखनेन ॥६१॥
देशोद्देशाच्चक्रवृद्धिर्विवृद्धा कालोद्देशाद्वास्य चातिक्रमे तु ।
यन्न प्राप्नोत्युत्तमर्णोऽधमर्णात् तेनैतद्ग्राह्यं यथालेखनं तत् ॥६२॥
अप्राप्ते त्वेवं पुनर्देशकालौ वृद्धिप्राप्त्या लेखनीयौ विशेषात् ।
एवं त्रेधा लेखने कारितेऽपि नैरास्यं तत्स्वामिनोऽप्राप्य चान्ते ॥६३॥
भारे प्रोक्तं देशकालव्यवस्था वाहानां या वाहकैश्चेद्व्यपेता ।
भारस्तत्रान्यैर्यथायोजनीयो देशाचारज्ञैस्तथैव व्यपैति ॥६४॥
यस्यास्तेयत्प्राप्तिभाव्यं तु तेन तद्देयद्रव्यं तदैवार्पणीयम् ।
नायातश्चेत्प्रातिभाव्यप्रणीतो भीतो देयद्रव्यवेलामतीत्य ॥६५॥
पुत्रो दद्यात्पैतृकं प्रातिभाव्यं नो वा शुल्कस्यावशेषं सुरायाः ।
दण्डं मिथ्या दानमक्षैः कृतञ्च द्रव्यं पित्रग्रे न भिन्नक्रियोऽसौ ॥६६॥
मत्तोन्मत्ताभ्यामृणं बालवृद्धव्य. . .र्तसंबन्धिभिर्यत्कृतं तु ।
देयत्वेन प्रातिभाव्यं परेणाप्येतत्पुत्रो नैव दद्याद्यथेष्टम् ॥६७॥
पित्रा मात्रा भ्रातृभिर्येन केन प्रादायर्णं रक्षिता ये यथैव ।
दद्युः पुत्राद्या विभक्तास्तथैव दायादाश्चैभ्यो यथादायभागम् ॥६८॥
यत्प्राबल्याद्भुक्तमादाय यच्च प्राबल्येनैवात्मना लेखितञ्च ।
स्वात्मार्थस्याद्यैरसाक्षि स्वकीयैर्दायादैर्देयन्न मैत्र्याद्युपात्तम् ॥६९॥
यच्चाग्राह्यं तच्च नादेयमस्ति धर्मारण्ये दुर्बलेनापि राज्ञा ।
यच्च ग्राह्यं तद्ग्रहीतव्यमेव द्रव्याढ्येनापीह कर्माश्रितेन ॥७०॥

आदेयञ्चानादरेणाप्यगृह्य यो वा ग्राह्यञ्चाददीतावरात्सः।
राजा दौर्बल्यं यशोभिः प्रयाति प्रेत्य स्वर्गाद्विच्युतो याति भूयः ॥७१॥
गोविप्राणामुत्तमानाञ्च सेवा रक्षार्तानां सङ्गतिस्सज्जनानाम्।
राज्ञामैश्वर्य्यप्रदाः सद्यशोभिराख्यातानां स्वर्गतिं कारयन्ति ॥७२॥
कामक्रोधौ सन्नियम्येन्द्रियार्थान् पश्येद्राजा धर्म्मराजप्रभावैः।
प्रीत्याऽप्रीत्या स्वप्रजानिर्दयोऽसौ भूत्वा जायन्ते वशेऽस्यैव लोकाः ॥७३॥
द्रव्यं गृह्णीयाच्छलेनाधमर्णो यो वेत्युक्त्वा राजकीयोऽहमस्मि।
राज्ञा दण्ड्योऽसौ चतुर्भागमूर्द्ध्वं यद् द्रव्यं यस्यैव तद्दापनीयम् ॥७४॥
दातुं न स्याद्यः समर्थोऽधमर्णो द्रव्यं कुर्यादुत्तमर्णस्य कर्म।
जात्योत्कृष्टो वा समो योऽधमर्णो न स्त्रीभूतः पातयेत्पातनीयम् ॥७५॥
निक्षिप्तान्नादि स्वयं यद्विनष्टं राज्ञा निक्षेप्तुर्न तद्दापनीयम्।
नष्टं यच्चात्मोपकाराय लभ्यामेतस्मै दापयेत्तद्विशेषात् ॥७६॥
कन्यामन्यां दर्शयित्वा विवाहयोग्यामन्यामर्पयेत्सोपि दण्ड्यः।
कन्यादण्डेनाथवाऽऽजन्मरक्षा योग्यद्रव्येणाशु राज्ञा विविच्य ॥७७॥
योऽन्यद्द्रव्यं चास्मदीयं निवेद्य विक्रीणीते साक्षिणस्तद्ग्रहे च।
दद्याद्दण्ड्योऽसौ पुनः साक्षिणोपि चौरस्याद्वा शुद्धदण्डेन राज्ञा ॥७८॥
सम्भोगो वोपार्जनं स्वत्वहेतु श्रेष्ठं तत्रोपार्जनं भोगतोऽस्ति।
यच्चैकेनोपार्जितं द्रव्यमेव भुञ्जानाः पश्वादयोऽस्वामिनस्ते ॥७९॥

इति श्रीरघुनन्दनसिद्धान्तभट्टाचार्यविरचितायां धर्मसिद्धान्तसंहितायां
राजधर्मनिरूपणे व्यवहारप्रदर्शने नवमोऽध्यायः ॥९॥

अथ द्रव्यमात्माश्रितन्नान्यदीयमविज्ञाय विक्रेयमार्य्यैः कदापि।
तथा ग्राह्यमावेदितश्चौरवृत्त्या स्ववृत्त्या परे यन्न संधारयन्ति ॥१॥
न विज्ञायते विक्रयी यस्य तस्य क्रयी चौरकर्म्माश्रयी सन्निवेद्यः।
उभौ यत्र चौर्य्याश्रितौ तत्र राज्ञा क्रयी दण्ड्यते विक्रयी सन्निरोध्यः ॥२॥
न विक्रेयमन्योपसृष्टं तथान्यन्निवेद्यान्यदेवाथवान्यूनसारम्।
न दूरेऽथवान्तर्हितं वादयोग्यक्रयिप्रेक्षितैर्विक्रयी दण्डयोग्यः ॥३॥
गृहीत्वा तु यो दक्षिणामश्रमेण भ्रमेणापि वाचाल्पकार्यं करोति।
स दण्ड्यः पुनः कारितेनैव तेन स्वयं कर्मणा धर्ममार्गाश्रितेन ॥४॥
समादाय प्रागादयेद्द्रव्यमेभ्यः पुनर्दापयेत्तन्न कुर्वन्ति तेभ्यः।
नृपो दातुरेवातुरारंभिणोऽस्य स्वयं वा ततः कारयेद्धर्म्मकार्यम् ॥५॥

अनार्तोऽपि भृत्ये नियुक्तो न कुर्य्यात् क्रिया यो यथादण्डनीयस्तथैव ।
अदत्वा भृतिं दर्पतश्चेन्न कुर्यात् स राज्ञा भृतेरष्टभागैरयोज्यः ॥६॥
सदार्तः पुनर्योजितो यश्च कार्य्येऽनिवेद्याल्पतां तद्भृतेः सोपि चान्यैः ।
समं वेतनान्यर्हति प्रायशोऽत्र स्वकार्य्योदये चेन्न निर्वृत्तिमेति ॥७॥
सदार्यैर्मुदा सेविते सत्यधाम्नि नृपाग्रेऽथवा सज्जनानाञ्च पार्श्वे ।
प्रतिज्ञातमप्यापलप्यारभेद्यस्स्वकार्याणि राज्ञा स निष्कासनीयः ॥८॥
दशाहान्तरक्रीतमक्रीतरीत्या पुनर्दापयेत्तच्च विक्रेतुरेव ।
क्षितीशोनुसन्दिग्धमन्यैस्ततोऽर्वाक्कृते विक्रये क्रेतुरेवास्त्यपूर्वम् ॥९॥
न कन्येयमेषोऽपुमानित्यवज्ञाम्मृषान्यात्मजस्याचरेद्द्वेषबुद्ध्या ।
भवेद्यावतोद्वाहकर्म्मानयोस्तावता दण्डसम्भारसंहारणीयः ॥१०॥
विनष्टः कृमिव्याकुलो मृत्युमेति श्वभिः खादितोऽरक्षितः पालकेन ।
पशुर्यो मृतो वाथवैषम्यतस्तम् स्वयं स्वामिनः पालकादाददीरन् ॥११॥
वृकव्याघ्रभाल्वादिभिर्मारितोऽसौ समुत्प्लुत्य गोष्ठेऽथवारण्यमध्ये ।
न देयस्तदा पालकेनाल्पबुद्ध्या वृथा स्वामिनोऽस्याङ्गसन्दर्शनोर्द्ध्वम् ॥१२॥
व्यवहारकर्म किमपीह दर्शितं तदुपेत्य भूपतिरुपैतु भावनाम् ।
सकलापराधविनिवृत्तिहेतवे निजदण्डमेषु विधिवन्नियोजयेत् ॥१३॥
अनुभाविताप्यननुभाविमानवैः क्षितिपेन या व्यवहृतिर्गरीयसी ।
गुरुभिस्स्वगौरवतया निवेशिता त्वयि साधकैः स्वधिकृता न मन्यताम् ॥१४॥
कृतिना विशेषविधिवाधमिच्छता व्यवहाररीतिरधिगम्य याश्रिता ।
बहुधाल्पकार्यवसतो विगर्हिता क्षितिपेन नेयमपरैर्विचाल्यते ॥१५॥
स्वयमेव साधयति यत्र भूपतिर्व्यवहारमापदि न तत्र ताः प्रजाः ।
निपतन्ति किन्तु सुखिनस्सदैव याः प्रणियोजयन्ति बहुशः सुभाशिषः ॥१६॥
अथ दायभागमनुकूलभेदिनां प्रणियोजयेन्नृपतिरागमोदितम् ।
पितुरूर्द्ध्वमेव बहुमातृजन्मनामपि मातुरूर्द्ध्वमिह चैकजन्मनाम् ॥१७॥
यदि पूर्वजोनुविभृयाद्यथोचितं सकलास्तदा तदनुगाः कनीयसः ।
पितरं यथानुययुरेषु कर्मसु बहुधा भवेयुरपरेपि ते तथा ॥१८॥
पितरं करोत्यनृणमेष जन्मतस्सकलार्थभागत इहोच्यते बुधैः ।
पितुराज्ञया तदनुजोऽपि जायते सकलार्थभागधिकसेवनक्षमः ॥१९॥
मुखदर्शनेन ननु यस्य जायते पितुरुन्नतिः सुखसमेधितास्वयम् ।
अनृणत्वमप्ययमतोऽस्ति धर्मजः खलु पूर्वजस्तदितरे च कामजाः ॥२०॥

कुलज्येष्ठवृत्तिर्भवेद्यो जनानामनन्यो यशोवर्द्धको धर्ममेत्य।
स पूज्योऽन्यदीयैरपि ज्येष्ठसेवाप्रबन्धैः कनिष्ठादयः पूजनीयाः ॥२१॥
न चेज्ज्येष्ठवृत्तिस्तु योऽनेन सार्द्धं वसेन्नैव धर्मार्थहेतोः कनिष्ठः।
अपि श्राद्धकर्माद्यशेषोपयोगे स वन्यवग्रतः पूजनीयस्सदैव ॥२२॥
विभागे लभेज्ज्येष्ठवृत्तिश्च विंशमिहास्यार्द्धमस्याल्लभेन्मध्यमोऽपि।
तदर्धं कनिष्ठोऽवशिष्टं समेत्य स्वयं भागसाम्यैर्भजेयुस्त एव ॥२३॥
गजाश्वाद्यपि क्षेत्रकार्योपयोगि स सर्वप्रधानं लभेज्ज्येष्ठवृत्तिः।
न चान्येऽन्यथाभाविनो भावहीनाः पितुस्सेवया चेन्नवीना न ये स्युः ॥२४॥
गृह्णीयाज्ज्येष्ठो दशभ्योऽधिकत्वे विंशेभ्यस्त्वेकं पुनर्मध्यमोऽपि।
चत्वारिंशद्भ्यः कनिष्ठोप्यपूर्वमेकं पश्चात्ते यथाभागमीयुः ॥२५॥
नास्त्युद्धारो ज्येष्ठवृत्तिर्दशभ्यः किंतु श्रेष्ठं ज्येष्ठतायै नियोज्यम्।
स्वेभ्योंऽशेभ्यो भ्रातरस्ते प्रदद्युः कन्योद्वाहार्थं यथायोग्यमेव ॥२६॥
यच्चाजाश्वादिस्वभागावशिष्टं तज्ज्येष्ठस्यैवेदमुक्तप्रकारैः।
ज्येष्ठोढा ज्येष्टाथवा स्त्री स्ववस्त्रालंकारादीन्नैव दद्यात्कदापि ॥२७॥
पूर्वोढायां यः कनिष्ठस्स एव ज्येष्ठो ज्येष्ठेभ्यः कनिष्ठात्मजेभ्यः।
उद्वाह्यैनां न द्वितीयामुपैति यत्स्वर्लोकान् कर्मभिर्धर्मपूर्वम् ॥२८॥
गृह्णीयात्सर्वं स एवासमर्थो दद्यादन्येभ्यो यथाभागमेभ्यः।
ज्येष्ठेभ्यो ज्यैष्ठ्यं समादाय किन्तु स्वाधीनान्येभ्यो न वा दास्यदेभ्यः ॥२९॥
प्राबल्येनैते कनिष्ठात्मजाश्चेज्ज्येष्ठाः सर्वस्वं हरेयुस्तदेभ्यः।
राजा तस्माद्दापयित्वाल्पमस्मै ज्ज्येष्ठापुत्रायाशु दद्यात्समस्तम् ॥३०॥
हित्वा पूर्वोढामथान्यासु जातास्तेषां ज्येष्ठां जन्मनास्त्येकजातौ।
वैजात्ये तु ब्राह्मणादिक्रमेण किं चिद्दत्वैतद्विभागस्समेत्य ॥३१॥
जन्मज्येष्ठोऽस्त्येकगर्भप्रसूतानेकेषां ज्येष्ठः सहैव प्रसूतौ।
भिन्नस्त्रीजातो जनन्यां क्रमेण ज्येष्ठः श्रेष्ठो जायते कामजोऽपि ॥३२॥
पुत्रीं पुत्रत्वे तु मन्येत यस्य पुत्राभावोऽसौ समुच्चार्य वाचम्।
अस्यां यो जायेत गर्भो भवेत्स पुत्राभावे चेति कर्ता स्वधायाः ॥३३॥
एवं पुत्रीकृत्य दक्षः स्ववंशविस्तारञ्चक्रे समर्प्यात्मजांस्ताः।
अन्येभ्यः पुत्रांस्तथैवाददीत पुत्राणामात्मस्वधातोषकर्तॄन् ॥३४॥
आत्मा पुत्रः पुत्रिका पुत्ररूपा तिष्ठन्त्यामस्यामपुत्रीकृतायाम्।
अप्यन्यो वप्तो यथाग्राममेत्य साक्षात्स्वं हर्तुंन्न शक्नोति कोऽपि ॥३५॥

मातुस्सर्वस्वं हरेयुः कुमार्यो भ्रातृप्रीत्योद्वाहनीया यथैता ।
द्रव्यं दौहित्रस्स्वमातामहस्य प्राप्नोत्यद्धा पुत्रहीनस्य लोके ।।३६।।
दद्याद् द्वौ पिण्डौ स्वमातामहाय पित्रे चेत्पुत्रीकृतो यस्त्वपुत्रो ।
भूतः पित्रादिभ्य एवाशु दत्वा दद्यादापो मातृमातामहेभ्यः ।।३७।।
दौहित्रः पौत्रेण तुल्योऽस्ति लोके धर्मात्पुत्रीपुत्रयोरात्मजत्वम् ।
यत्तुल्यं तस्मात् तयोरात्मजत्वे को वा भेदो भावितो भावहीनैः ।।३८।।
दौहित्रे पुत्रीकृते वान्यदीये पुत्रो जायेतात्मभार्योदयाय ।
भागस्तत्रोक्तः समत्वेन न स्त्री पुत्रे प्रोक्ता ज्येष्ठता श्रेष्ठतायै ।।३९।।
वाकोवाक्यैः पुत्रिकायां कृतायां पुत्रान्नानुत्पाद्य पुत्र्यां मृतायाम् ।
तद्भर्तैव तद्धनं सर्वमेत्य कुर्यात्कर्माणीह पिण्डार्पणादि ।।४०।।
पुत्रैस्स्वर्लोकानवाप्नोति पौत्रैस्तत्रानन्त्यं स्वात्मनः सौख्यहेतु ।
पुत्राणां पौत्रैरवाप्नोति सूर्यलोकान्यत्राभासते ज्ञाननिष्ठः ।।४१।।
पुत्रीपुत्रो निर्वपेत्पूर्वमात्ममातुः पिण्डं तत्पितुस्तत्परं तु ।
दद्याज्जीवन्मातृकस्तूर्ध्वमस्या मातुः पित्रे तत्पितुस्तत्पितुश्च ।।४२।।
दत्तोप्येवं सर्वमस्याददीत धर्म्मारूढोऽस्याशु कृत्यं विधाय ।
धर्मानारूढस्त्वकृत्वास्य कर्म वोभूयाद्दायादमुख्यैः सहार्थः ।।४३।।
दद्याद्दत्तो नैव पिण्डान्स्वपित्रुद्दिष्टान्नो वै तद्धनस्यापहारी ।
गोत्रन्नोपैत्यस्य यस्यार्थमेति तस्यै तस्यैवास्ति धर्मावशिष्टम् ।।४४।।
पुत्रिण्याप्तो देवरादप्रयुक्तोत्पन्नो वानार्हत्यपूर्वोदयाय ।
भ्रातॄणां सत्वे धनं कामजोऽसौ विज्ञातो यज्जारजः क्षेत्रजोऽपि ।।४५।।
युक्तायामुत्पादितोऽन्यैर्विधानहीनैर्नाप्नोतीत्येष दुष्टप्रसूतः ।
दायादैरस्वीकृतोऽज्ञाय धर्मवृत्त्या तस्योत्पत्तिमाविष्कृतार्थैः ।।४६।।
चातुर्वर्ण्यस्त्रीप्रसूतास्तु कुर्युस्सर्वद्रव्ये धर्म्यभागान् दशैव ।
चत्वारो ब्राह्मीसुतस्य त्रयोऽत्र तन्न्यूनस्य द्वावतोप्येकमेव ।।४७।।
शूद्रीपुत्रो नांशभाक्किन्तु पित्रोः सेवासन्नो जीविकामाददीत ।
पित्रोः प्रीत्या यत् समाप्नोति तद्वत्तच्चैतस्यैवेति धर्मव्यवस्था ।।४८।।
पुत्रा ये जातास्सवर्णा सुते तु सर्वे ज्येष्ठोद्धारमुद्धृत्य भूयः ।
भूयः श्रेष्ठेभ्यो निवेद्य स्वपित्रादिद्रव्यं सर्वं यथाभागमीयुः ।।४९।।
शूद्रस्त्री शूद्रैव तद्गर्भजाता दद्युर्ज्येष्ठ्यं नैव ते पूर्वजाय ।
कर्माण्यस्योक्तानि लोके यथैव कुर्य्युः पुत्रा ये कनिष्ठास्तथैव ।।५०।।

अन्यक्षेत्रेऽन्येन चोत्पादितो यः पुत्राभावे स द्वयोर्द्रव्यहारो।
पुत्रे तूत्पन्ने पितुर्द्रव्यमेव गृह्णीयाच्चैष प्रयातुर्नरस्य ॥५१॥
धर्मेणोद्वाह्य स्वयं संस्कृतायां पत्युत्पन्नानौरसान्विद्धि पुत्रान्।
मीतस्य क्लीवस्य च व्याधितस्य क्षेत्रे धर्मोत्पादितः क्षेत्रजोऽसौ ॥५२॥
दद्यान्माता वा पितापद्भिरद्भिः संकल्प्यैनं दत्रिमं विद्धि पुत्रम्।
साजात्यात्स्वीयार्थसंरक्षणार्थं कर्मार्थं योऽङ्गीकृतः कृत्रिमोऽसौ ॥५३॥
अज्ञातोऽरण्यात्तथा द्वारदेशादानीतः प्रक्षेपितोऽन्यैः स विद्धः।
अन्तस्तल्पोत्पादितोऽप्यन्यदीयभार्यायां यज्जायते गूढजोऽसौ ॥५४॥
कन्यागत्योद्वाहिता मातृपित्रोः स्थाने कानीनस्समुत्पादयेद्यम्।
यो गर्भिण्युद्वाहनाज्जायतेऽसौ वोढुर्विज्ञेयः सहोढो विधिज्ञैः ॥५५॥
दत्वा द्रव्यं मातृपित्रोर्यथैव क्रीणीयाद्यं स क्रयात्क्रीत एव।
त्यक्ता भर्त्रोत्पादयेदन्यसङ्गाद्वैधव्ये पौनर्भवो जायतेऽसौ ॥५६॥
त्यक्तो मात्राद्यैः स्वयं यः समेत्य ब्रूतेऽहं ते स स्वयंदत्त उक्तः।
विप्रः शूद्रायां समुत्पादयेद्यं तस्य ज्ञेयं पारशव्यं विशेषात् ॥५७॥
प्रोक्ताः पुत्रा द्वादशैते विशेषादौरस्यं यस्यैव पुत्रः स एव।
अन्ये पुत्रप्रातिनिध्यं समेत्य धर्मन्यूनाः सत्क्रियाकारिणोऽपि ॥५८॥
भ्रातृणामेकोपि चेत्पुत्रयुक्तः पुत्रेणानेनैव सर्वे सपुत्राः।
बह्वीनामेका भवेत्पुत्रयुक्ता स्त्रीणां सापत्न्ये तु सर्वाः सपुत्राः ॥५९॥
यः श्रद्धावान् पैतृके कर्मणीह धर्मज्ञो विद्याविनीतस्तथैव।
स द्रव्यस्यास्याधिकारी महीन्द्रैः कार्यो नान्ये न्यायतो ज्ञानहीनाः ॥६०॥
न भ्रातॄणां वा पितुर्वाधिकारः सर्वादाने किन्तु पुत्रोऽधिकारी।
पुत्राभावे भ्रातरो भ्रात्रभावे पित्राद्या ये ज्ञातयो ज्ञानयुक्ताः ॥६१॥
पित्रादीनामेव तेषां त्रयाणां कुर्यात्कर्माण्यार्यमार्गप्रवृत्तः।
पुत्रो येषामाददीतार्थमत्र चत्वारोर्थे साधिकारा भवन्ति ॥६२॥
वीक्ष्यानन्तर्य्यं सपिण्डक्रियायां पारंपर्येणैव तद्दापनीयम्।
तेषां सर्वेषामभावे सकुल्यो गृह्णीयाद्द्रव्यं गुरुर्वाथ शिष्यः ॥६३॥
एषां सर्वेषामभावे तु विप्रा विप्रद्रव्याण्याददीरंस्त एव।
ये त्रैविद्या ज्ञानिनो धर्मयुक्ता दान्ताः शान्ताः शौचयुक्ता भवन्तु ॥६४॥
विप्रद्रव्यं नापहार्य्यं महीपैः सर्वाभावेऽपीयमेव व्यवस्था।
अन्येषां द्रव्यं तथाभावितन्तु ग्राह्यं राज्ञा धर्मकर्माश्रितेन ॥६५॥

संस्थाप्राप्तस्यानपत्यस्य भार्य्या गोत्रात्पुत्रं रक्षणायाददीत।
तद्द्रव्यं तस्योपपाद्याशु कर्म तस्याद्धानेन स्वयं कारयेच्च ॥६६॥
वादप्राप्तावौरसक्षेत्रजौ च स्त्रीद्रव्ये स्यातान्नो पितृद्रव्यभाजौ।
मातृद्रव्येऽन्यस्य नैवाधिकारः कन्यासत्त्वे वौरसे जातमात्रे ॥६७॥
जातास्सर्वे मातरि प्रस्थितायामुद्वाहार्थं स्वस्वसृभ्यः समर्प्य।
द्रव्याण्याददुर्यथाभाजितानि यानि स्त्रीद्रव्यातिरिक्तानि तानि ॥६८॥
मातामह्या द्रव्यमाभ्योपि किञ्चिद्दत्वा दद्युस्ते यथाभागमेव।
मातृष्वसृद्रव्यं तत्पित्रभावे देयं किञ्चित्तद्दाभ्यो विशेषात् ॥६९॥
अध्यग्न्यध्यावाहनीयं तथैव प्रीत्या भर्त्रा पूर्वमेवार्पितश्च।
पित्रा मात्रा भ्रातृवर्गैरवाप्तं स्त्रीद्रव्यञ्चैतद्विनिर्दिष्टमस्ति ॥७०॥
वृत्तायास्स्त्रीद्रव्यमस्याः प्रजायाः पत्यौ जीवत्यप्रजायास्तु पत्युः।
गान्धर्वे ब्राह्मेऽथ दैवे तथार्षे पूर्वोक्तद्रव्यं यथोक्तं तथैव ॥७१॥
स्त्रीद्रव्यं यच्चासुरादिष्ववाप्तं पुत्राभावे भाविपित्रोर्मृतायाः।
भर्तृस्थाने भर्तृगामि स्वभावात् सर्वं तस्या मातुरेवाप्रजायाः ॥७२॥
भर्त्रादिद्रव्यैरलङ्कारिता यास्ता निहार्य्याः स्त्रीभी राज्ञाश्रिताभिः।
तद् भ्रातॄणां भर्तुराज्ञानुसारात्सालङ्काराश्चेद्वरो भर्तुरेव ॥७३॥
जीवद्भर्त्रा न स्त्रियाऽलङ्कृतिः स्वादेया दायादाः स्त्रिया याच्यमाना।
तद्भर्त्रा किन्तु स्वभागाद्विविच्य देयोऽलङ्कारादिरस्यास्तथैव ॥७४॥
क्लीवो जात्यन्धः स्वयं पातितश्च मूकोन्मत्ताविन्द्रियज्ञानहीनाः।
नांशैर्योज्याः किन्तु दायादमुख्यैर्भूयो रक्ष्या भाविवस्त्राशनाद्यैः ॥७५॥
क्लीवाद्या दारेषु पुत्रान्कदापि स्वीयेषूत्पन्नान् समेत्यात्मजातान्।
तद्दायेनैवाप्नुवन्त्यात्मदायभागं भूमौ भूपतेर्दापनीयम् ॥७६॥
ज्येष्ठो यद्द्रव्यं पितुः स्वीकरोति भ्रातॄनावेद्यानवेद्याप्यमत्या।
दायादैरेतत्कनिष्ठैर्विभाज्यं विद्याशीलौदार्य्ययुक्तैः समन्तात् ॥७७॥
विद्याहीना भ्रातरो ये समेत्य कुर्य्युर्द्रव्योपार्जनं तद्विभागः।
साम्येनैषामुच्यते साम्यमेव द्रव्योत्पत्तौ चेत्तथैषामवाग्भिः ॥७८॥
विद्याप्राप्तं यद्धनं येन तत्तु तस्यैवोक्तं मैत्र्यमौद्वाहिकञ्च।
पित्रादिद्रव्याण्यनादाय यच्चोपात्तं व्यापारेण तत्तस्य वाच्यम् ॥७९॥
सर्वद्रव्यानीहया कर्मकुर्याद्यो वा भ्राता भ्रातृभिः स स्वयं च।
निर्भाज्यो दत्वांशमस्मै कियद्यत्तत्पुत्राद्या नो विवादं भजेयुः ॥८०॥

पित्रादिद्रव्यं तथाप्तं स्वशक्त्या यच्चाप्राप्तं तैर्नतद्देयमेभ्यः ।
भ्रातृभ्यो येनोपयान्ति प्रकामं तद्द्रव्यस्योपार्जने चापि तेभ्यः ॥८१॥
ज्येष्ठो न भ्रातृन्विकुर्वीत लोभात् कुर्याच्चेत्कार्य्योयमार्य्यैरभागः ।
येवाऽधर्म्मस्था विकार्य्यार्यमार्गं भावैर्दुष्टा भ्रातरस्ते विभाज्याः ॥८२॥
मातापित्रोर्जीवतोः पुत्रभागे प्राप्ते पुत्रैरंशभाक् तत्पितापि ।
साम्ये नैवोद्र्ध्वं पुनर्जायते चेत्पुत्रोऽभाज्योऽयं पितुर्द्रव्यमेत्य ॥८३॥
पुत्रस्यापुत्रस्य माता धनानि गृह्णीयाल्लोके प्रमीतस्य तस्य ।
मातुः स्त्रीद्रव्यं स्वयं ज्येष्ठपुत्रपत्नीह प्राप्नोति सेवाफलेन ॥८४॥
सर्वद्रव्यस्याप्यभुक्तो विभागो लोकप्राप्तर्णस्य तद्वद्विभागः ।
वस्त्रालंकारादि यद्यच्छरीरे तन्नार्यैर्दास्ये विभाज्यं कदापि ॥८५॥
इति विविधकलासु कौशलेन क्षितिपवरेण विलोक्य येन कार्यम् ।
बहुविधनिजकर्म्मधर्म्मपूर्वम् न विकृतिरस्य न राज्यतो निपातः ॥८६॥

इति श्रीरघुनन्दनसिद्धान्तभट्टाचार्यविरचितायां धर्म्मसिद्धान्तसंहितायां
दायभागनिरूपणेन राजधर्म्मपरिष्कारे दशमोऽध्यायः ॥१०॥

दारोपेतब्राह्मणस्य द्वितीये आयुर्भागे संस्थितस्येह धर्म्माः ।
व्याख्यायन्ते श्रीगुरोः पादसेवाप्राप्तार्थस्यैव स्वधर्माश्रितस्य ॥१॥
भूतानामद्रोहतो वाल्पदोयैर्बाल्यद्रोहैः कर्मभिर्धर्म्मपूर्वम् ।
वृत्तिस्तामाश्रित्य जीवेदनाद्यापद्यात्मप्रीतितोऽपीह विप्रः ॥२॥
अक्लेशैः स्वैः कर्मभिर्जीवनार्थं संचीयार्थं संचितार्तामृताभ्याम् ।
जीवेद्विप्रो वार्धिकैर्याचितैर्वा वाणिज्येनैवापि सत्यानृताभ्याम् ॥३॥
उञ्छानामेवार्जनेनार्तमेति यच्चायाच्याप्नोति लोकेऽमृतं तत् ।
सेवा त्याज्या कुक्कुरस्येव किन्तु विद्वद्विप्राणां विशेषोदयाय ॥४॥
शैलोञ्छाभ्यामग्निहोत्री स्ववृत्तिं कृत्वा यज्ञान् पर्वसु स्वागतेषु ।
कुर्यात्कैवल्योदयायेह विप्रो लोके श्रेयस्तद्यशो वर्द्धनाय ॥५॥
वृत्यै लोकव्यायतैः कर्मभिर्यो जीवेद्विप्रोऽप्राणबाधे यथेष्टम् ।
ब्राह्मण्यं तस्य स्वयं हीयतेऽत्र कर्मक्षेत्रे धर्मलोपैर्विशेषात् ॥६॥
संतोषेणैवात्मनः सौख्यमेति विप्रोऽसन्तोषेण दुःखं प्रयाति ।
सौख्यार्थी संयम्य सर्वेन्द्रियाणि कुर्यात्कर्माणि स्वधर्मोदयाय ॥७॥
वेदोक्तं कुर्यात्स्वकर्म स्वभावैरेतत्त्यक्त्वातन्द्रितो वापि मोहात् ।
मान्यत्वं नाप्नोति चेह स्वकीर्तिं कृत्वा धर्मेणेव लोकान् प्रयाति ॥८॥

प्रातः सायं चाग्निहोत्रैस्तथैव दर्शेनार्द्धे मास्यथ पौर्णमासैः।
शस्येष्टचा शस्यप्रभूतावृतूनामन्ते विप्रोद्धा यजेदध्वरेण ॥९॥
मांसाशी विप्रोऽथवान्यो द्विजोद्धा कुर्याच्छागैरायनश्राद्धकर्म।
वर्षान्ते सोमोपक्लृप्तैर्मखैश्च कुर्यात्कर्माण्यार्यधर्मप्रवृत्तः ॥१०॥
यज्ञानेतान् यः करोत्यात्महेतोर्दीर्घायुर्लक्ष्मीं यशोभूतिमत्र।
संप्राप्नोत्यद्धा सुखान्यन्यथा तु प्राणानिच्छत्यग्नयोऽस्तुं तथास्य ॥११॥
सायं प्राप्तस्यातिथेरासनादि शक्तचा चान्नादि स्वयं श्रद्धयैव।
दद्याद्विप्रस्य त्रयाणां तथैव दासाद्यैरास्त्रास्य वर्णक्रमेण ॥१२॥
पाखण्डाढचानागतान् हैतुकांश्च मार्ज्जारीं वृत्ति स्थितान् द्वारदेशे।
दृष्ट्वा सम्यक् वाग्भिरप्यासनस्थान्नार्च्चेदन्यैश्चालयेद्बालकैस्तान् ॥१३॥
सद्विद्योपेतान् व्रतस्थान् गृहस्थान् श्रौताचारैरावृतानागतांस्तु।
हव्यैः कव्यैरर्च्चयेत् नव्यकृत्ये भव्योपेतोऽन्याननव्यान् विहाय ॥१४॥
न क्लिश्येद्विप्रः क्षुधा स्नातकोऽसौ राज्ञो द्रव्याण्याददीतान्यतोऽपि।
वैश्यादिभ्यो वासिनो वाप्युपेतं गृह्णीयाद्द्रव्यं स्वतो वाश्रमेऽपि ॥१५॥
सर्वाभावे शूद्रसान्निध्यमेत्य ब्रूयाद्विप्रोऽप्रार्थ्य सेवां विधेहि।
भुक्त्वा चास्यान्नं जपेत्सायमात्मशुद्धयै गायत्रीसहस्रं त्र्यहेण ॥१६॥
शूद्रान्नैः पुष्णन्ति ये वा त्र्यहेण विप्राः प्रायश्चित्तयोग्या भवन्ति।
तावत्कुर्वीरन्व्रतं यावदस्य भुक्त्वान्नं पुष्टानिरन्नक्रमेण ॥१७॥
कृत्वा केशान् श्मश्रु च श्रान्तरीत्या दान्तः सर्वार्थेषु शुक्लाम्बरश्च।
शुद्धात्मा स्वाध्याययुक्तो नितान्तं भूयाद्विप्रोऽध्यापनादौ समर्थः ॥१८॥
नेक्षेतोद्यन्तं रविं वार्द्धमस्तं नोपस्पृष्टं वारिमध्ये नभोऽन्तः।
नैवोलङ्घेद्वत्सतन्त्रीं प्रवर्षत्यम्भोदे धावेन्न विप्रः कदापि ॥१९॥
आत्मानं नेक्षेत वारिस्थमात्मास्यं वा रात्रौ दर्शनेप्यानिमज्ज्य।
नित्यस्नानं नैव कुर्वीत रात्रौ कार्य्याभावे ब्राह्मणश्चार्यरीत्या ॥२०॥
देवान् विप्रान्वाद्यमम्भःश्रवश्चतीर्थं गां सर्पिर्दधि क्षीरमंबु।
गच्छेद्दक्षीकृत्य पार्श्वस्थलीषु संप्राप्तानेतान्द्विजाग्र्यो विशेषात् ॥२१॥
नैव स्त्रीणामार्तवे संगमंगीकुर्यादङ्गस्पर्शने नैकशय्याम्।
प्रज्ञामैश्वर्यं स्वतेजोबलं च स्वायुर्विद्यां वर्द्धयन् ब्राह्मणोऽत्र ॥२२॥
छिक्कां कुर्वन्तां तथा जृम्भमाणामासीनामात्मस्त्रियं चाञ्जयन्तीम्।
नाश्नन्नीक्षेताश्नंतीं वाङ्गलेपैरभ्यक्तां नग्नां स्रवन्तीं द्विजाग्र्यः ॥२३॥

नाश्नीयादन्नं शिखाकक्षहीनो वस्त्रेणैकेनावृतो वापि विप्रः ।
स्नायान्नग्नो नैव मूत्रं पुरीषं मार्गे कुर्याद्गोव्रजे नाश्ममूर्द्धिन ॥२४॥
वाय्वग्नी विप्रं तथादित्यमम्भः पश्यन् गाविण्मूत्रयोर्नो विसर्गम् ।
विप्रः कुर्यात्रिच्छिलायां न भूमौ कृष्टक्षेत्रे वा सरित्तीरदेशे ॥२५॥
रात्रौ कुर्याद्दक्षिणशामुखस्थो विण्मूत्रे विप्रो दिवोदङ्मुखस्तु ।
छायायां गाढान्धकारे यथैते कुर्याद्विप्रोऽह्वा तथैवेह योग्यम् ॥२६॥
नाग्नौ पादौ तापयेन्नैनमास्यं वायुस्पर्शैर्वर्द्धयेन्नाप्यशुद्धम् ।
किंचिद्वह्नौ प्रक्षिपेन्नोपलंघ्येद् भूमौ चैनं प्रक्षिपेन्नाप्यमेध्ये ॥२७॥
न प्राणाघातं चरेत्कर्म सन्ध्याकाले नाश्नीयान्न गच्छेद्विशेद्वा ।
भित्तौ नैवं प्रोल्लिखेद्भूतलेऽपि धृत्वा माल्यं नापहृत्य क्षिपेच्च ॥२८॥
मूत्रं मेध्येऽष्ठीवनासृक्विषाणि नास्थीन्यप्सु प्रक्षिपेदन्यथैव ।
नैकः स्वप्याच्छून्यसद्मान्तराले सुप्तं नैवाकार्यमुत्थापयेच्च ॥२९॥
नैवेन्द्रस्योद्यद्धनुर्दर्शयेच्च नैव ग्रामेऽधार्मिके व्याधियुक्ते ।
नात्यत्यन्तं पर्वतोर्ध्वं वसेद्वा नाध्वानं चैकः प्रपद्येत्कदापि ॥३०॥
नाश्नीयान्निस्स्नेहमत्यन्तमन्नं सायं प्रातर्वाप्यतृप्तो न सायम् ।
चेष्टां कुर्वीत स्वयन्नाञ्जलिभ्यां नद्यां तीर्थे वा पिबेद्वारि विप्रः ॥३१॥
नाश्नीयाद्धस्ते निधायापि किंचिन्नृत्येद्गायेद्वादयेन्नाप्ययोग्यम् ।
बाहूभ्यां नास्फोटयेन्नान्यरावै रावं कुर्यादार्य्यमार्गप्रवृत्तः ॥३२॥
कांस्ये पादाम्बु क्षिपेन्नैव भिन्नपात्रेऽश्नीयाद्भावदुष्टेन चापि ।
वस्त्रादि त्यक्तञ्च यज्ञोपवीतमन्योच्छिष्टोपानहौ नाददीत ॥३३॥
जीर्णं वस्त्रं धारयेन्नासनञ्च भिन्नं चिछन्द्यान्नाङ्गुलीभिस्तृणानि ।
गच्छेन्नाद्वारेण रात्रौ न वृक्षमूले तिष्ठेन्नासनेऽद्यात्कदापि ॥३४॥
नोच्छिष्टो नग्नोऽथ वारण्यदेशे स्वप्यादस्तेऽद्यान्न रात्रौ तिलाढ्यम् ।
नानार्द्रां विंशाङ्गुलीभिस्समेत्य भुञ्जीतान्नं नापि दुर्गां प्रपद्येत् ॥३५॥
विण्मूत्रं नेक्षेत नोल्लंघ्य गच्छेत्केशादीन् भस्मास्थिशुद्धान्कदापि ।
शूद्रायोच्छिष्टं न दद्यादविद्वा धर्मं ब्रूयान्नास्य कर्मव्रतञ्च ॥३६॥
धर्मं ब्रूते योऽस्य कर्मव्रतञ्च स प्रेत्याद्वासंवृतं याति लोकम् ।
सार्द्धं तेनैव स्वयं यः करोति यज्ञादीनज्ञस्स यात्यन्धतायै ॥३७॥
पाणी संहत्य स्वमूर्द्धादिकण्डूयां कुर्य्यान्नैवं स्वपित्रोर्विरोधम् ।
पूना चक्रस्त्री ध्वजाद्याश्रये च तिष्ठेद्राज्ञो नान्यता तस्य विप्रः ॥३८॥

भुक्त्वा न स्नायान्न शीघ्रं न वस्त्रैस्सार्द्धं नानोवितवापीसरस्सु (?)।
देवानां राज्ञो गुरोस्स्नातकस्य च्छायां नैवोल्लंघयेद्भ्रुणोपि ॥३९॥
शत्रोः सेवां नैव कुर्वीत शत्रुप्रीतं दूरादुत्सृजेत्तस्करं च।
अन्यस्त्रीसंभाषणादि स्वभावाद्विप्रो धर्मज्ञस्त्यजेच्चातुरत्वम् ॥४०॥
राजानं सर्पं तथा ब्राह्मणञ्च वृद्धं सर्वार्थश्रुतं नापसर्पेत्।
संक्रुध्यैवं मन्त्रिणं नाप्यघोरतन्त्रज्ञं यन्त्रप्रचारप्रयोगैः ॥४१॥
नात्मानं लोकेऽवमन्येत विप्रो वस्त्रालंकारादिदौर्बल्ययुक्तः।
लक्ष्मीमन्विच्छेत् सदा धर्मपूर्वमामृत्योर्मन्येत नैनां दुरापाम् ॥४२॥
सत्यं ब्रूयान्नाप्रियं च प्रियन्तु नासत्यं ब्रूयात्कदापीह विप्रः।
एषो धर्मः सर्वदा सेवनीयो विप्रैर्भद्रोऽस्त्याप्यभद्रप्रयोगे ॥४३॥
वृद्धान्सेवेत स्वकीयासनञ्च योग्येभ्यो दद्यात्स्वयञ्चागतेभ्यः।
वद्ध्वा चैव प्रांजलिं सुप्रसाद्य विप्रश्चैतान् गच्छतोऽप्यन्वियाच्च ॥४४॥
लोके वृद्धान् सेवमानस्य तस्य श्रीर्धीः कीर्तिर्जायते सद्वृतिश्च।
तेषामाशीर्वादवाग्भिर्विचित्रा वाचो विद्याभूतयोद्धा भवन्ति ॥४५॥
आचारोपेतस्य विप्रस्य भूयो लक्ष्मीवृद्धिर्जायते सत्प्रसूतिः।
पुत्रैः पौत्रैः सौख्यमात्मप्रभूतिर्लोके स्वर्लोकोदयो वा परत्र ॥४६॥
यत्र स्वातन्त्र्यं भवेदात्मनो वा प्रीतिर्यावत्तावदेवात्र तिष्ठेत्।
सौख्यार्थं लोकेऽन्यथा दुःखमेति प्रायस्तस्मान्नाचरेत्पारतन्त्र्यम् ॥४७॥
चापल्यं नैव प्रकुर्वीत विप्रो न द्रोहं नाधर्मकार्यप्रवृत्तिम्।
यामीभिर्वा भ्रातृपुत्रादिवर्गैर्वादं कुर्यान्नैव स्वर्लोककामः ॥४८॥
दातुर्ये लोका भवन्तीह दानैः प्रायः सामर्थ्येऽगृहीतुर्भवन्ति।
लोका दानाग्राहिणोपेत एव दातुर्दत्तेऽपात्रदाने तथैव ॥४९॥
दातुश्चापाञ्जायते तृप्तिरिष्टा सौख्यञ्चाक्षय्यं तथैवान्नदातुः।
दाता दीपस्योत्तमञ्चक्षुरिष्टान्पुत्रादीन्प्राप्नोति दाता तिलानाम् ॥५०॥
भूमिं दत्वाप्नोति भूमिं हिरण्यदानैर्दीर्घायुस्समाप्नोति लोके।
दत्वा सद्माग्र्याणि वेश्मानि भूयो रूप्यं दत्वात्यद्भुतं रूपमेति ॥५१॥
वासो दानैश्चन्द्रलोकानुपैति लोकान्सूर्यस्याश्वदानैः श्रियन्तु।
पुष्टांगो दानैरवाप्नोति शय्यादानैर्भार्यां भूतिमाभैः प्रदानैः ॥५२॥
मिथ्यालापैर्नाशमायान्ति यज्ञास्तेजांस्यादानैस्तपो विस्मयेन।
नश्यत्यायुर्विप्रवादेन दानं दत्तं यत्स्यात्तत्स्वयं कीर्तनेन ॥५३॥

पित्राद्या ये पूर्वजा ये च पुत्राद्या भ्रात्राद्या विद्यमानाः सहैव ।
नात्मानं रक्षन्ति तस्मात्परत्र रक्षार्थं धर्मस्य कार्यश्चयोऽत्र ॥५४॥
गर्भादिको जायते प्रायशोऽत्र प्रायो नश्यत्येक एवेह जन्तुः ।
तद्वच्चैको यातनामन्तकाले प्राप्नोत्यैश्वर्य्यं तथा स्वर्गलोके ॥५५॥
द्रव्यागारे द्रव्यमश्वादयोपि स्वे स्वे स्थाने द्वारदेशे स्त्रियः स्वाः ।
भ्रात्राद्याश्चैनं त्यजन्ति श्मशाने देहश्चित्यां धर्म एकोनुगोऽस्य ॥५६॥
तस्माद्‌बन्धुर्धर्म एव स्वभावाज्जीवात्मा येनैव सार्द्धं प्रयाति ।
माता धर्मस्तत्पिता धर्म एव पुत्रो धर्मो येन चानन्त्यमेति ॥५७॥
उच्चैरुच्चैरुत्तमामेति कीर्तिं सार्द्धं नीचैर्नीचतामेति जीवः ।
तस्मादुत्कृष्टैस्सहाजस्रमेव वर्तेतामुत्र त्यजेन्नीचसंगम् ॥५८॥
प्रारब्धा त्यागीमृदुर्दानशीलो दान्तोऽहिंस्रोऽक्रूरभूतैरुपेतः ।
स स्वर्गं यात्यंजसा सार्द्धमेव प्रारब्धैरारब्धकार्योदयेन ॥५९॥
विप्रो भिक्षामाददीतावरेभ्योप्यायातामात्मोन्मुखेऽयाचिता या ।
सर्वेभ्यो ग्राह्यं फलं मूलमेधोऽभीतिर्ग्राह्या दुर्ज्जनेभ्योपि लोके ॥६०॥
देवा नाश्नन्त्यस्य पित्रादयोपि श्राद्धादावन्नं दशाब्दान्तराले ।
नाग्निर्हव्यान्युद्वहत्यस्य या संप्राप्तान्नन्त्यज्यते येन केन ॥६१॥
वाच्येवार्थाः वेदविद्यादयो ये ये वा यज्ञा वेदमूला यतोऽत्र ।
तां वाचये(?) व्यर्थमुच्चारयन्ति भ्रष्टास्ते ते याश्च मिथ्याप्रलापैः ॥६२॥
देवर्षिस्वात्मीयपित्राद्यनृण्यं गत्वा विप्रो भारमासज्य पुत्रे ।
मध्यावस्थायामबन्धक्रमेण स्थित्वैकाकी स्वाश्रमेऽभीष्टमेति ॥६३॥
स्मृत्वा ब्रह्माखण्डमद्वैतरूपं धृत्वाध्यात्मन्यात्मसायोज्यमस्य ।
एकान्ते निर्वाणमेत्येह लोके भूयो भूयो नैति सोऽद्धा भवाब्धौ ॥६४॥
इति परिचितकर्माण्याचरन्तो मनुष्या प्रबलतरसुधर्मारण्यकाष्ठैरुपेताम् ।
स्वगुरुभिरुपनीतां नावमारुह्य भक्तिमतिसुगमभवाब्धिं ते तरन्त्यत्र धन्याः ॥६५॥

इति श्रीरघुनन्दनसिद्धान्तभट्टाचार्यविरचितायां धर्मसिद्धान्तसंहितायां
परिष्टब्राह्मणसदाचारनिरूपणे एकादशोऽध्यायः ॥११॥

अथ वयसि तृतीये पञ्चपंचाशदूर्ध्व-
प्रकलितसकलार्थेऽस्मिन्भवे पुत्रपौत्रैः ।
बहुविधसुखमेत्यैवात्मशैथिल्यगात्रः
स्वसुतवसतयाभार्य्यादि विन्यस्य गच्छेत् ॥१॥

त्यक्त्वा भार्यां वा सहैवाग्निहोत्रम्
आदायाग्न्याच्छादनञ्च स्वगृह्यम् ।
पुण्यारण्यं सत्सरित्तीरमेत्य
कुर्याद्विप्रस्तत्तपो दुष्करं यत् ॥२॥
मुन्यन्नैर्मेध्यैः फलैः शाकमूलैः
स्वां वृत्तिञ्चाफालकृष्टैर्विधाय ।
जित्वा सर्वाणीन्द्रियाण्यर्थशुद्धा-
न्यात्मन्यात्मानं नियुञ्जीत विप्रः ॥३॥

कामक्रोधौ कृच्छ्रशान्त्याद्युपायैर्जित्वा निर्लोभो भवेन्निर्ममत्वे ।
संसारासारत्वमेत्येति निर्मोहत्वाहंकारत्वनिर्मत्सरत्वम् ॥४॥
एवं षट्शत्रून् विनिर्जित्य भूयोऽभिप्रेतार्थे मानसं सन्नियोज्य ।
अम्मूलाद्यैर्नित्ययज्ञान् विधाय तैरेवातिथ्यं करोत्वागतानाम् ॥५॥
शुद्धस्स्नात्वा चीरचर्म्माम्बरश्च प्रातः सायं निर्मलान्तःस्वरूपः ।
गायत्र्या जप्त्वा सहस्रैकमेति दिव्यज्ञानं श्मश्रुलोमाद्युपेतः ॥६॥
दान्तः स्वाध्याये नियुक्तः सदैव दातानादाता च मैत्रो द्विजाग्र्यः ।
कृत्वा कार्य्याण्यार्यमार्गप्रवृत्त्या नार्य्या युक्तः स्वर्ग्गलोकं प्रयाति ॥७॥
पित्राद्युद्देशेन मास्याश्विने तच्छ्राद्धादौ त्याज्यं विशुद्धार्जितं यत् ।
वर्षान्ते वस्त्रादियद्भुग्नरूपं दासादिभ्यो देयमेतत्क्रमेण ॥८॥
नाश्नीयात्फालोपकृष्टं पृथिव्यामुत्सृष्टं कैश्चित्तथा ग्रामजातम् ।
पक्वं काले वाऽग्निना वाश्मदन्तोलूखलाद्यैः कुट्टमद्यात्सदैव ॥९॥
भुञ्जीताहृत्यैव नित्यं सदैव मासान्ते वाहृत्य षण्मासमध्ये ।
वर्षान्ते वैकदोपार्ज्य रक्षेद्वस्तूनीष्टानि स्वयञ्चात्मकुट्याम् ॥१०॥
नित्यायातं नावमन्येत तेनानित्यायातान् तोषयेत्साधुवृत्तान् ।
नक्तं भुंजीतावशिष्टं दिवा वा द्व्यह्नोस्त्र्यह्नो वैकदा स व्रतीव ॥११॥
कृच्छ्रैर्वा चान्द्रायणेन स्वभावाद्वर्तेत स्वात्मप्रभूत्यै सदैव ।
पत्रैः पुष्पैर्वा फलैः कालपक्वैरशीर्णैर्भूमावात्मना चोत्तमेन ॥१२॥
ग्रीष्मे पंचाग्निर्दिवाभ्रावकाशी वर्षायां हेमन्तकाले जलस्थः ।
कुर्य्यात्कर्म्माणीह नित्यान्यनित्यं देहं मत्वात्सत्तपोवर्द्धनाय ॥१३॥
त्रिःस्नात्वा देवर्षिपित्रादयो ये पूज्यास्तानर्चयेत्तथा तत्क्रमेण ।
उग्रैरात्मप्रापकैस्सत्तपोभिर्देहात्मानं शोषयेदात्महेतोः ॥१४॥

श्रौताग्नीनात्मन्यवस्थाप्य देशान् गच्छन्निस्सङ्गो व्रजेत्तीर्थमुख्यान् ।
नित्यश्नायी निर्मलान्तःस्वभावो नित्यानन्दो निर्विकारो भवेच्च ॥१५॥
तिष्ठेदेकत्रैव वा मौनमेत्य शुद्धे देशे निस्पृहोऽनग्निरेव ।
हित्वैकस्थानं तथैकासनञ्च ब्रह्मध्यानेनाप्रयत्नः सुखार्थे ॥१६॥
संप्राप्तार्थान्नावलम्बेत भूयो भूमौ वृक्षाधः शयीताल्पमेव ।
भक्ष्यं विप्राद्यैः स्वयञ्चाहृतं यत्तगृह्णीयादन्नवर्ज्जं फलादि ॥१७॥
अष्टौ वा ग्रासान् पुटेनोपहृत्य ग्रामाद्विप्रेभ्योऽन्नमद्याद्विधाय ।
सेवेतैवं स व्रती स्वात्मसिध्यै संसेव्यानात्मोवयस्य प्रकारान् ॥१८॥
ऐशानीमाशान्तथाधिप्रभूतौ गच्छेत्स्वेच्छातो वनस्थो मुमूर्षुः ।
देहस्यापातात्पिबेद्वारिमात्रं जीवन्मुक्तो भुक्तभोगोऽत्रजन्मा ॥१९॥
वृत्तीनामासामुपादाय चैकामप्यानन्दब्रह्मविध्वस्तपापः ।
निर्द्वन्द्वो भूत्वाऽभयोऽजिह्मगश्च ब्रह्माधीत्य ब्रह्मलोकं प्रयाति ॥२०॥
एवं सम्प्राप्ते वनस्थश्चतुर्थे स्वायुर्भागे षष्टिवर्षोपरिष्टात् ।
विश्रान्तो यज्ञादिकर्म्मप्रकारैस्त्यक्त्वा संगनान् प्रव्रजन्नेत्यभीष्टम् ॥२१॥
यज्ञैरिष्ट्वा देवतानामृषीणामानृण्यङ् गत्वा तपोभिर्व्रताद्यैः ।
पुत्रानुत्पाद्य प्रयत्नेन मोक्षमिच्छेदानृण्यं पितृणामुपेत्य ॥२२॥
यज्ञांश्चानिष्ट्वानधीत्येह वेदान् पुत्रान्वामाङ्ग्यामनुत्पाद्य यस्तु ।
मोक्षेच्छावान् स प्रयाति स्वकर्म्मभ्रष्टः कष्टां तान्दशां यत्र नष्टाः॥२३॥
दत्वा भूतेभ्योऽभयं निर्भयोऽत्र निस्संगोऽङ्गीकृत्य चात्मप्रयाणम् ।
गच्छन् दिग्वासां सुखाशामपास्य योगान् युञ्जानो यतीमुक्तिमेति ॥२४॥
धर्म्माः पूर्वोक्तास्सवर्णाश्रमाणां कर्म्माण्यप्युक्तानि न न्यासिनोऽत्र ।
त्यक्ताहंकारस्य देहादिवर्गानालभ्यं स्वर्गापवर्गादिरस्य ॥२५॥
यावद्धीह्लीश्रीकृतीच्छाप्रवृत्तिः शोभाद्याश्चैनं स्त्रियो न त्यजन्ति ।
कामक्रोधाद्याश्च यावज्जयन्ति तावन्निर्मुक्तिर्यतेर्दुलभैव ॥२६॥
कामाद्यैः षड्भिर्जिता ये सपत्नैर्ये वेच्छाद्यैः स्त्रीभिरालिंगिताश्च ।
भ्रान्ता येऽहंकारमोहान्धकारे ब्रह्मज्योतिर्दुर्लभैषा यतीनाम् ॥२७॥
तेभ्यः श्रेष्ठा ये वनस्था गृहस्था यैरेकैवांगीकृता वामभागे ।
स्त्रीयज्ञव्यापारकर्त्री न मायोपेता न्यासित्वे वृथा मुण्डिनो ये ॥२८॥
इच्छाद्यैः स्त्रीभिर्विनिर्मुक्तदेहो मौनी निष्कम्याश्रयादाश्रयं वा ।
गच्छन्नारम्भी यतात्मा क्रमेण कुर्व्वन् कर्म्माणि स्वयं योगमेति ॥२९॥

यावन्नग्नो नैति लज्जां न भग्नो दुःखं मग्नः सच्चिदानन्दरूपे ।
विश्यल्लग्नो भूतवर्गान् जनेषु तावन्न्यासित्वेपि कुर्य्यात्स्वकर्म ॥३०॥
नाग्नीन्सेवेत स्वयं न स्पृशेच्च तिष्ठेन्नैकत्र त्रिरात्रं यतात्मा ।
न स्त्रीसंभाषोपचारक्रमेण भिक्षां लिप्सेतात्मना ग्राममेत्य ॥३१॥
श्रीभिक्षार्थं गत्वा यतिर्ब्राह्मणानां द्वार्योमित्युक्त्वा क्षणं तत्र तिष्ठेत् ।
भिक्षालाभे नैव हर्षेदलाभे सीदेद्वा सिद्धस्ततोऽन्यत्र गच्छेत् ॥३२॥
रोगादिक्लेशानुपेक्षेत नेच्छेत्सौख्यं संप्राप्तान्नतो नान्यदिच्छेत् ।
एकीकृत्यान्नाद्यनेकं सदैव भुंजीताष्टग्रासमात्रां विधाय ॥३३॥
दृष्ट्या पूतं विन्यसेत्पादमम्भो वासःपूतं दृष्टिपूतं पिबेद्वा ।
सत्या सम्पूतां वदेद्वाचमत्र न्यासीच्चेतो ज्ञानपूतं विधाय ॥३४॥
वादांस्त्यक्त्वाऽन्यावमानं विहाय वैरं कुर्य्यात्केन चिन्नापि लोके ।
क्रुद्धायैवं न प्रतिक्रोधमेत्य द्रुह्येदाक्रुष्टो वदेद्वाचमुच्चैः ॥३५॥
अध्यात्मप्रीतिः सदासन्न एव भूयात्कृत्वा यात्रिकं कर्म्म चादौ ।
आत्मैकापेक्षस्तथैकेन तेन गच्छेदिच्छातस्स्वकालप्रतीक्षः ॥३६॥
नोत्पाद्योत्पातान्न नक्षत्रविद्योद्योगैरंगानां तथा शासनेन ।
भिक्षां लिप्सेताथ गच्छेन्न विप्रैर्वानप्रस्थैर्भिक्षुकैरुद्धवेश्म ॥३७॥
पात्रीदण्डीक्लृप्तकेशादिरात्मप्राप्तानन्दस्सर्वभूतान्यपीड्य ।
तिष्ठेद्विप्रद्वारदेशोपदेशे तावद्यावन्नास्य भिक्षामुपैति ॥३८॥
पात्राण्यस्यालावुदारुप्रभूतान्युच्यन्ते वा मृण्मया तैजसानि ।
शुद्धिस्तेषामद्भिरेव प्रयुक्ता शश्वद्यज्ञोपस्कराणामिवात्र ॥३९॥
सायं गत्वा ग्राममावेद्य भिक्षावाक्यं भिक्षामाददीतैकदेव ।
नालाभे क्लिश्येन्न हर्षेच्च लाभे प्राणत्राणार्थन्नमात्राश्रयी स्यात् ॥४०॥
संपूज्यान्नं यः प्रयच्छेद्विशिष्टं शिष्टं धर्म्मज्ञं जुगुप्सेत चैनम् ।
यो वानादृत्य प्रयच्छेत्तथाल्पं सन्तुष्टोस्मीत्येनमद्धा वदेच्च ॥४१॥
संपूज्यान्नैर्दीयमानैर्निबद्धो मुक्तोऽप्रीत्या जायते दीयमानैः ।
अल्पान्नैर्भुक्तैस्तथैकान्तवासैस्सर्वेषां भूतिं हरेच्चेन्द्रियाणाम् ॥४२॥
मैत्रीमालापं वृथाटयामपास्य सार्द्धं स्त्रीभिर्लौकिकैर्वा मनुष्यैः ।
रागद्वेषौ स्वेन्द्रियाणां प्रचारमारम्भादीन्वा विहायेत्यभीप्सम् ॥४३॥
मैःयेच्छामाप्नोति कामान् तयेह कामात्क्रोधादीन् सपत्नांस्तु पंच ।
तैरानद्धस्तैलचंक्रोपबद्धो नेत्रारुद्धो गौरिवायात्यमुत्र ॥४४॥

तस्माद्दृष्ट्वा संसृतीर्लौकिकानां भूतानां वा कर्म्मजा यातनाश्च ।
संयोगानन्यैस्तथाविप्रयोगा नात्मीयैरारान्ज्जराजीर्णताञ्च ॥४५॥
देहत्यागे चोपपीडां पुनर्वा संभूतिं गर्भे तथासृङ्नगर्ते ।
कुम्भीपाकादिष्ववेक्ष्य स्वकर्म्मसंपाकादीन् धर्म्ममाधारयेच्च ॥४६॥
योगैः पश्येदात्मनः सूक्ष्मरूपं धर्म्माधर्म्माभ्यान्तथा सौख्यदुःखे ।
धर्म्मं कुर्य्याद्यत्र तत्राश्रमेऽपि न स्याच्चैषोऽन्यायतो लिङ्गजीवी ॥४७॥
भूतान्संरक्षन् भुवि भ्रान्तिहानो भूत्वा भूयो भौतिकेऽस्मिन् शरीरे ।
हन्याज्जन्तुर्यावतः तावतान्तु प्राणायामान् षट्प्रकुर्य्याद्विशुध्यै ॥४८॥
प्राणायामाः शोधयन्ति त्रयोपि विप्रान्संन्यास्तान् शुद्धान्विकारैः ।
चेतस्संभूतैर्न सर्वेन्द्रियाणि साक्षात्स्वार्थे व्याकृतानीह यानि ॥४९॥
सम्यक्च्छास्त्रार्थैरुपेतो यतात्मा कुर्वाणः कर्म्माण्यबद्धोऽर्थलाभैः ।
तद्धीनो बद्धो विरुद्धार्थलाभैस्संसारं प्राप्नोत्यसारं विशेषात् ॥५०॥
हिंसात्यागैरिन्द्रियार्थाप्रसङ्गैः वेदोक्तैरुग्रैस्तपःकर्म्मभिश्च ।
आत्मज्ञानेच्छायुतो ज्ञानमेति तद्येनैव ब्रह्मसायोज्यमेति ॥५१॥
अस्थिस्थूणं स्नायुयुक्तञ्च मांसासृक्लिप्तं चर्म्मावनद्धं शरीरम् ।
दुर्गन्धं विण्मूत्रपूर्णं जराद्यैर्नश्यं रोगाद्यैस्तथैवातुरं च ॥५२॥
ज्ञात्वानित्यं चात्मकार्य्योपसेव्यं पक्षीवात्मीयं त्यजन्नीडमेनम् ।
कृच्छ्रग्राहान्मुच्यतेऽस्मिन् भवाब्धौ कृत्वा कर्म्माण्यप्यधर्म्माश्रितानि ॥५३॥
कुर्य्याद्वात्मीयेषु नैवात्मबुद्धिमन्येष्वन्यान्वा न विन्यासयुक्तैः ।
सर्व्वेष्वर्थेष्वात्मना योजितेन ब्रह्मज्ञानेनाभ्युपैत्यात्मभावम् ॥५४॥
भावैर्भूत्वा निस्पृहः सर्वभावे त्यक्त्वा सङ्गान्निर्भयो भूतलेऽस्मिन् ।
ध्यानैरध्यात्मानमेत्यैकचित्तो भूयो भूयो भावयन्नात्मरूपम् ॥५५॥
आध्यात्मब्रह्माधिदैवन्तथैव नित्यं प्रोच्चार्याधियज्ञं स्मरेद्यः ।
नित्यं साक्षात्सच्चिदानन्दरूपमद्वैतं प्राप्नोति स प्रेप्सितं यत् ॥५६॥
कृत्वापीह ब्रह्मचर्य्यं तथैव वानप्रस्थ्यं वा यतित्वं प्रयान्ति ।
भिक्षाहेतोर्यद्गृहस्थाश्रमन्ते तच्छ्रेष्ठः सर्वाश्रमिभ्यो गृहस्थः ॥५७॥
देवाः सर्व्वे तुष्टिमायान्ति तस्य यज्ञैरिष्टा येन गार्हस्थ्यमेत्य ।
ये तु ब्रह्मर्ष्यादयस्ते व्रताद्यैः पित्राद्यास्तुष्यन्ति पुत्रप्रसूतौ ॥५८॥
सर्वैरेतैस्साश्रमैः संनिषेव्यो धर्मः क्षान्तिर्दान्तिरस्तेयता च ।
शौचं धीर्विद्या धृतिस्स्वेन्द्रियाणामारोधोऽक्रोधस्सदा सत्यवाक् च ॥५९॥

धर्म्मान् सेवन्तो दशैतांस्त एव विप्राः प्रोक्ताः धर्म्मकामार्थपूर्णाः।
तूर्णं निर्वृत्तिं त एव प्रयान्ति ये न भ्रान्ता भूतलेऽस्मिन् कृतार्थाः ॥६०॥
स्वप्ने दृष्टार्थानिवैतान् विदित्वा सर्वान् स्वात्मीयांस्त्यजन्ति स्वभावात्।
त्यागोपायान् नाविदन्तोऽनभिज्ञान्मिथ्याचन्द्रानेकतान्दर्शयन्ति ॥६१॥
रज्जौ सर्प्पभ्रान्तिविभ्रान्तचित्तो रज्वा संबद्धेन विद्धोऽङ्कुरेण।
दृष्टन्तेनात्मानमावेद्य मूर्च्छामाप्नोत्येवं मूर्च्छितोऽज्ञानबद्धः ॥६२॥
वेदान्ताभ्यासैरभिज्ञानवेद्यमात्मानं जीवात्मतां यातमत्र।
ज्ञात्वैवाम्भोबुद्बुदत्वं यथायमज्ञानान्मुक्तः प्रयाति स्वरूपम् ॥६३॥
सन्यासेनैवात्मबुद्धेः शरीरे द्रव्यादावात्मीयतायाश्च लोके।
ब्रह्मज्ञानात्सच्चिदानन्दरूपो भूत्वा नित्यब्रह्मभावं प्रयाति ॥६४॥

एतच्छास्त्रं निगमविधिनाधीत्य शुद्धाशया ये
स्नात्वा श्रीमद्गुरुपदयुगध्यानविध्वस्तपापाः।
मोक्षं प्राप्स्यन्त्यविकृतधियस्तेऽत्र धर्म्मार्थकामैः
सम्पूर्णाः स्युर्जगति जयिनो मासपारायणेन ॥६५॥

श्रीः। इति श्रीमत्कान्यकुब्जदेशोद्भवश्रीमद्वेदान्तविद्याभूषणश्रीमल्लक्ष्मीनाथ-
भट्टाचार्यात्मजरघुनन्दनतर्कालङ्कारसिद्धान्तवागीशभट्टाचार्य-
विरचितायां धर्म्मसिद्धान्तसंहितायां चतुर्थाश्रम-
सिद्धिनिरूपणे द्वादशोऽध्यायः ॥१२॥

PREFACE

Pandit Raghunandana Bhaṭṭāchārya, the author of the *Dharmasiddhāntasaṁhitā*, was a Kānyakubja Brāhmaṇa of village Goni in the District of Hardoi (U. P.). He was born in 1899 Saṁvat. His father Pandit Lakṣmīnātha Tripāṭhī was a good Sanskrit scholar. Pandit Raghunandana was brought up under the expert guidance of his elder brother, a Paurāṇika, Pandit Jīvarakṣaṇa Tripāṭhī. For his higher studies the author approached Pandit Umāpati Tripāṭhī the *sabha Paṇḍita* of the ruler of Ayodhyā, Śrī Mānasingh, more known, as Dadu Saheb. Under him he studied Vyākaraṇa. Later on, he went to Navadwīpa in Bengal and studied there Navyanyāya. Then he came to Calcutta. He studied Dharmaśāstra and systems of philosophy. He appeared in a Viva-Voce test and obtained the title of *Tarkālaṅkāra* and *Siddhāntavāgīśa* in 1867. A. D.

Raghunandana Tarkālaṅkāra was a very successful teacher and a debator in Śāstra. He was honoured wherever he went. He was the author of the following works :—

१—सनातनधर्मसिद्धान्तः (प्रकाशितः)
२—धर्मसिद्धान्तसंहिता (प्रकाशिता)
३—दिग्विजयाश्वमेध
४—पञ्चलक्षणी
५—दायनिरूपण
६—लक्षणावाद
७—कृत्यर्थवाद
८—शिवस्तुति
९—सदाशिवस्तुति
१०—सद्दूषणोऽयम्
११—पाखण्डिभुण्डिनिदर्शनम्
१२—शब्दार्थसुधाकर (अपूर्ण)
१३—सिद्धान्तकौमुदीव्याख्या (अपूर्ण)
१४—शम्भूदत्तरूपक भाषाकाव्य
१५—भवानीसिंहभूषण भाषाकाव्य (अपूर्ण)

F. 26

He died in 1961 Saṁvat and left four sons and two daughters behind. The names of his sons are—Vidyāvāgīśa Tripāṭhī, Rāghavendra Tripāṭhī, Yogendra Tripāṭhī and Surendranātha Tripāṭhī.

The Institute has published one of his works in its Journal at the request of his son Sri Surendranātha Tripāṭhī.

OUR PUBLICATIONS AND THEIR PRICE

Sl. No.	*Name of Publications*	*Price Rs.*
1.	Journal of Ganganatha Jha Research Institute, Volume I — XXXVII (1943 — 81) Rs. 40/- per volume; if older than 5 years Rs.	50.00
2.	Mahakalsamhita (Kamakalakhanda) 2nd Edition underprint	
3.	Mahakalasamhita (Guhyakalikhanda) Part - I	70.00
4.	— do — (— do —) „ - II	60.00
5.	— do — (— do —) „ - III	48.00
6.	Annual Bibliography of Indology, 1969	30.00
7.	Annual Bibliography of Indology, 1970-71	110.00
8.	Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Mss.	
	Vol. I Part I	25.00
	Vol. I Part II	35.00
	Vol. II Part I	35.00
	Vol. II Part II	45.00
	Vol. III	45.00
9.	Sanskrit Documents in National Archives of India	15.00
10.	Modern Assamese Literature	6.00
11.	Janaraja Champu	14.00
12.	Bapu (in Sanskrit)	10.00
13.	Kavyaprakasha with three unpublished commentaries	60.00
14	Mimamsa Jurispradance	4.00
15	Pratimoksasutra of Mahasamghikas	5.00
16	Mimamsarasapalvalam	5.00
17.	Jatak Mala—Fk Adhyayana	40.00
18.	Jahangira Virudavali	5.00
19.	Vani Vilasitam	10.00
20.	Padyaracana (Subhashitas)	15.00
21.	Gautamiya Sutra Prakasha (Nyaya)	24.00
22.	Nyayatatparya Dipika (Nyaya)	26.00
23.	Anvikasanayatattvabodha (Nyaya)	18.00
24.	Chakra Kaumudi (Tantra)	14.00
25.	Jhansiswari Charitam	12.00
26.	Kapishayani (Ordinary Ed.)	21.00
	- do - (Library Ed.)	27.00
27.	Virudavali (Shahjahan)	5.00
28.	Bhattarka (Ordinary Ed.)	21.00
	— do — (Library Ed.)	32.00

29.	Sahitya Kaumudi		61.00
30.	Vaisesika Sutra Vritti (Sugama)		9.00
31.	Bhargava Tantram		36.00
32.	Anekantavada, Ek Adhyayana		56.00
33.	Shantishatakam		16.00
34.	Vani Vilasitam Part II	(Ordinary Ed.)	24.00
	— do —	(Library Ed.)	30.00
35.	Baudhayan Shrauta Sutram		55.00
36.	Haravijaya Mahakavya	Part - I	75.00
	— do —	Part - II	60.00
37.	Ratimanmathanatakam		32.00
38.	Siddhanta Lakshana with Subodhani Comm.		
39.	Shrivatsa : ek mangalika pratika		
40.	Drahyayana Shrautasutra with Comm. of Dhanvin		
41.	Mridvika, a modern Sanskrit Kavya		

Discount :– (a) To Book Sellers — 40% (on all publications including journals)

(b) To Libraries — 25% on journal, 20% on other secondary Literature e.g. Catalogues, Bibliographies, 15% on texts (e.g. Mahakalsamhita etc.)

(c) To Teachers/Students - 15% on all publications.

To be had of :–

Principal,
Ganganatha Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha.
Chandrashekhar Azad Park,
Allahabad–211002.